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Introduction

Chaplaincy is a significant aspect of university life. The chaplaincy is often the first port of call for students of faith, as well as for non-religious students, staff, international students and those seeking a supportive, listening ear. Moreover, chaplains often play an important role in the management of on-campus challenges concerning religious discrimination, religious extremism and freedom of speech, their work increasingly framed by legal obligations issued in the Equality Act (2010) and the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act (2015). In the 21st century, university chaplaincy is often organised around a multi-faith model, under the auspices of a full-time coordinating chaplain who is most likely to be Anglican. This report, from the largest multi-method study of university chaplaincy, explores how this model of operation is worked out in practice. At a time of new public scrutiny of religion in universities, this report offers evidence to help shape the future of chaplaincy across the university sector.

Report aims

The overall aim of the report is to provide universities, religious bodies and student organisations with an evidence base and recommendations to enhance chaplaincy provision across the university sector. The report takes an innovative approach by examining the experiences and perspectives of the four key constituencies that shape university chaplaincy: (1) chaplains themselves; (2) the students who engage with chaplaincy services, and the decision-makers who determine how university chaplaincy is resourced and managed; (3) university managers and (4) religion and belief organisations. These perspectives are not understood in isolation, but in relation to one another within the social realities of university life.

The report presents fresh empirical data across the majority of UK HEIs, with a detailed focus on five universities, selected to represent the institutional diversity of the UK HE sector. Following a typology developed in Guest and Aune’s (2013) research, these five ‘types’ encompass: (1) one ‘traditional elite’ university; (2) one ‘red brick’ university; (3) one ‘1960s campus’ university; (4) one ‘post-1992’ university and (5) one Cathedrals Group university. Within each, the four constituencies were engaged via interviews and surveys to explore the following overarching questions:

• What is the purpose and value of university chaplaincy?
• How are chaplains and chaplaincy volunteer staff equipped for their work?
• What are chaplains understood as doing, with whom, and where?
• Who accesses chaplaincy services and why?
• How do chaplains’ perceptions of their role differ from those of university managers, religious decision-makers and students, and with what consequences?
• How and to what extent might chaplaincy within Cathedrals Group institutions – as the group of universities that self-consciously gathers on the basis of their Christian foundation and ethos – constitute a distinguishable phenomenon?

This report analyses different perspectives on these questions in order to build a complex understanding of the vocational identity of university chaplains. Particular attention is paid to the varying models (e.g. theological, professional, pastoral) that are invoked by each of the four constituencies in their understanding of university chaplaincy. We compare our telephone interview data with that gathered in 2006-7 for the Faiths in Higher Education Chaplaincy report (Clines 2008), producing a ‘10 years on’ picture of how chaplaincy is changing. Achieving a sense of the forward trajectory gives our account more capacity to address the challenges chaplaincy is likely to face in the near future. The new empirical data facilitates an evidence-based process of theological reflection from a specifically Anglican perspective, presented in Chapter 8.1 We hope a range of organisations who have a stake in HE chaplaincy will use our research to inform their future decision-making.2

Context and literature review

2.3 million students attend the UK’s 167 universities and higher education providers, three-quarters studying at undergraduate level and three-quarters studying full-time.3 The 2011 Census found that 60% of students identify with a religion, with Christians accounting for 45% of students, Muslims 10% and Hindu, Sikh, Buddhist, Jewish and other smaller religions making up the rest.4 Figures from 2016/17

1. Chapter 8 is included in reflection of the interests of the Church Universities Fund, who funded this research.
2. The research team would be happy to receive invitations to present the findings to universities, chaplaincies and religion and belief organisations. Please contact one of the authors to discuss this.
3. Figures are for 2016/17, as published by the Higher Education Statistics Agency. These include the 144 universities from which we drew our sample of chaplains, and 23 new, smaller and private providers.
4. Census 2011 data for England and Wales on religion indicates that 44.6% of ‘economically inactive’ students identified as Christian, 32.2% as ‘no religion’, 10% as Muslim, 2.4% as Hindu, 1.1% as Sikh, 1% as Buddhist, 0.6% as Jewish, 0.5% as ‘other religion’ and 7.5% did not give a response. https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/LC6205EW/view/2092957703?rows=c_ecopuk11&cols=c_relpuk11
Until the last decade, religion at university received almost no attention from researchers, and assumptions that university was a site of ‘secularisation’ and faith was a minority interest remained unchallenged. Several developments have challenged this status quo. First, policy: equality legislation including the 2006 Racial and Religious Hatred Act and the 2010 Equality Act has made it a requirement for universities to ensure equality of opportunity for students and staff who have a religious belief; these policy developments have trickled down to universities via agencies such as HEFCE (until 2018), Office for Students (from 2018), Universities UK and Advance HE (formerly the Equality Challenge Unit). Second, as student numbers have expanded more than fivefold since the 1960s, universities find themselves competing for applicants within a crowded market, striving to offer an enhanced ‘student experience’ through appealing to the interests of a diverse student constituency (e.g. providing high-quality sports facilities, student societies and prayer spaces). This became increasingly important alongside the decline in public funding for universities, the rise in student fees, part of a funding regime that has created a market and competition between universities. Third, several studies of religion in higher education have revealed that faith is important to many university students, and have sought to encourage universities to improve their support for religious students and staff. Finally, theologians (e.g. Ford 2017, Heap 2016, Highton 2012) have written on the theology of higher education.

Chaplains are important to the work of modern universities. The Church of England Board of Education commissioned the report *Faiths in Higher Education Chaplaincy* (Clines 2008), which surveyed lead chaplains in 103 universities. It raised awareness of the significant role chaplains play. It found that university chaplaincy is becoming increasingly multi-faith. Reporting that just over half of chaplains are volunteers, it also found that Church of England chaplains are the religious constituency most likely to hold full-time paid chaplaincy jobs and be the main chaplaincy coordinator. The majority of chaplains are part-time and Christian, but the research found increasing numbers of Muslim, Buddhist, Jewish, Sikh, Hindu and Baha’i faith advisors and identified a need for more Muslim chaplains. As well as being more multi-faith in the 21st century, chaplaincy is also more oriented towards welfare provision, with some chaplaincies being managed under the umbrella of student services or student wellbeing (Hunt 2013).

Yet beyond Jeremy Clines’s (2008) pioneering report, conducted a decade ago, Gilliat-Ray, Ali and Pattison’s (2013) study that included interviews with 11 Muslim further and higher education chaplains, and Rajput’s (2015) examination of the role of Muslim chaplains in Higher Education, there is very little research evidence about who university chaplains are, what they do, what challenges and opportunities they face in their work with students and staff, and what impact they have on campus. In the chaplaincy studies field, work on healthcare or prison chaplaincy is more developed than on higher education chaplaincy. Exceptions to this are where higher education chaplaincy is included in publications on chaplaincy more broadly: Caperon, Todd and Walters (2018), Legood (1999), Ryan (2015), Slater (2015), Sullivan (2014), Swift, Cobb and Todd (2015), and Threlfall-Holmes and Newitt (2011b), most of which comprise theological reflections and autobiographical accounts by chaplains. On the other hand, university chaplaincy has received some attention within publications addressing religion within higher education, including Guest, Aune, Sharma and Warner’s (2013) study of student Christianity which found that 1 in 10 Christian students saw chaplaincy or a chaplain as central to their university experience, or Ataullah Siddiqui’s important report on *Islam at Universities in England* (2007), which includes a helpful chapter on the evolving profile of chaplaincy among Muslim students.

Among the only publications addressing HE chaplaincy in isolation are Brown (2010), Cartledge and Colley (2001), Forster-Smith (2013), McGrail and Sullivan (2007), Possamai and Brackenreg (2009), Possamai et al (2014), Robinson (2004), Shockley (1989), Smith (2015), Williams (2013) and Williams (2018). Shockley (1989), though based on experience from the USA, provided early orientation when little else had been written. Cartledge and Colley (2001) identify three models of chaplaincy at Durham University (‘parish’, ‘sacramental’ and ‘denominational church gathering’) and ask which chaplains are adopting and which students want: they find all three at Durham, although consider none

---

5. These made up 29.6%. It is possible that certain religious groups are more likely to tick ‘prefer not to say’ than others, so these figures are unlikely to be entirely accurate. [https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/resources/2018_HE-stats-report-students.pdf](https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/resources/2018_HE-stats-report-students.pdf)


7. The study also conducted 24 site visits to chaplaincies and seven regional workshops.
of them to be working as well as they might and all lack a focus on mission. They note that whilst most students of the 133 they surveyed do not use chaplaincy, they nevertheless see it as an important support service. Robinson (2004) identifies 5 models of chaplaincy practised over the second half of the twentieth century: the ‘collegiate model’ (as found in universities such as Oxford and Cambridge), the ‘church model’ (as if the chaplaincy were a local church serving a parish, which is the university), the ‘liberationist model’ (a model developed in the 1960s-70s of the chaplain as activist challenging social inequalities), the ‘Waterloo model’ (building relationships on the move, akin to being in a busy railway station, such as happens in new or ‘post-1992’ universities) and the ‘student services model’, which he notes is ‘increasingly being explored by the most recent universities in which the university has a clearer say about the functions of chaplaincy’ (Robinson 2004: 42). This is a model we encountered repeatedly in the present research, although UK universities appear to adopt a range of approaches to embedding chaplains within a broader provision of student support.

Possamai and Brackenreg (2009) take up the theme of student use of chaplaincy. Their study of the University of Western Sydney in Australia (N=217) finds that students use chaplaincy more to assist their individual practice of faith and less to engage in group activities, and that a substantial proportion of these are Muslims. They conclude that the multi-faith identity of chaplaincy should be promoted more to ensure that chaplaincy can be used by students from all religious backgrounds. Possamai extends this work in a later article written with a different set of colleagues, again on the University of Western Sydney but this time drawing on data from student focus groups. Possamai et al (2014) note how chaplains’ work – especially its contribution to student welfare - is valued but not paid for by universities, a pattern the authors interpret through the lens of the ‘post-secular’.

Chaplaincy has also been the focus of attention among scholars interested in religion as a sociological phenomenon. Sullivan’s (2014) study highlights the ways in which chaplaincy encapsulates the complex relationship between religion, law and the state, existing as it does at the intersection between faith and the public realm. Sullivan maps the work of chaplains across a variety of institutions in the USA, charting what she calls their ‘ministry of presence’. In pointing to the ambiguity of the chaplain’s role, Sullivan echoes an earlier US study: Hammond’s The Campus Clergyman from 1966, which focused specifically on university chaplains. Hammond highlights the relative liberalism and radicalism of these clergy, which reflects an interest in social affairs and a critical perspective on their own traditions. However, between these two studies very little has been published specifically on higher education chaplains within the US context with the exception of Forster-Smith’s (2013) collection of multi-faith voices narrating a wide range of experiences of campus ministry. At the same time there has been an abundance of scholarship on the impact of higher education on the religiosity of students. A parallel growth of interest in religion in public institutions has tended to focus on prisons, hospitals and the military, rather than universities (e.g. see Cadge et al 2017).

In the United Kingdom, a resurgence of research into religion on university campuses has included some examination of the role of chaplains, but this has remained fairly marginal. Gilliat-Ray’s Religion in Higher Education: The Politics of the Multi-faith Campus (2000) was a major milestone, and while focusing on how universities as institutions negotiate the growing religious diversity of the United Kingdom, a chapter on chaplaincy forms a valuable benchmark for the current project. It builds on Gilliat-Ray’s previous work on prison chaplaincy, while highlighting distinctive characteristics of higher education as a context for chaplaincy. Gilliat-Ray observes that university chaplains are often drawn into crisis management, partly as they do not see their role as time-bound in the same way as student services professionals, and this changes expectations their institutions have of them. Correspondingly, and undoubtedly reflecting the disproportionately high presence of Anglican chaplains in universities, they tend to affirm their role as serving the entire university, rather than simply their own faith community amongst the students. This role includes often being called upon to be the ‘expert’ on all religions within the institution, a gatekeeper to religious knowledge within a fairly secular institution. At the time Gilliat-Ray did her research, this status had become especially important as chaplains were being called upon to advise on how their universities should navigate the challenges of a multi-faith environment. At the same time, while the general ethos affirmed by chaplains was inclusive, the resources accorded to them disproportionately favoured Christian students: ‘Students claiming a Christian religious identity are the principal beneficiaries of any money spent on hospitality, entertainment, chaplaincy outings, missions, retreats, or preachers’ (2000: 72). In this respect, Gilliat-Ray’s study marks a point in the development of university chaplaincy when the UK was recognised as religiously diverse, but the resourcing of chaplaincy had yet to catch up with this reality. One of the opportunities presented by the current research is to ascertain how this situation might have changed in the intervening years.
Prayer rooms are particularly necessary for Muslim students, and Gilliat-Ray’s (2000) study almost two decades ago found ‘evidence that at least one-third of institutions of higher education in the United Kingdom were providing a separate prayer facility for the exclusive use of Muslim students’; Gilliat-Ray goes on to comment: ‘although there appears to have been no further research on this subject, anecdotal evidence suggests that provision of Muslim prayer rooms is increasing in many universities’ (Gilliat-Ray 2005: 301). Gilliat-Ray’s (2000) typology of universities from suspicious or negative about religion towards positivity – as either ‘anti-religious’, ‘tolerant’, ‘anti-denominational’ and ‘multifaith pragmatist’ – is also useful to reflect on: does this still hold in today’s universities’ approaches to chaplaincy?

Theological themes explored in the higher education chaplaincy literature include, as Williams summarises, whether chaplaincy should be a ‘prophetic voice, in which the chaplain speaks into their context from the margins’, their ‘primarily identity…rooted in…God’ or ‘incarnational presence: the chaplain represents Jesus, and therefore the church, as actively involved in the life of the host institution, engaged with ensuring its well-being’ (Williams 2018: 4).

Williams suggests further options: chaplains as ‘translators and interpreters, enabling genuine communication to take place between the concerns of the church and those of the world it exists to serve’, and as ‘midwives of the developing identities of students’ (Williams 2018: 18). Finally, she explores the notions of chaplaincy as ‘accompanying presence’, ‘there not merely because they are paid to be, but because they are in relationship both with the university, with the individual student, and with God’ (2018: 19) and as mission: ‘university chaplains contribute to the mission of the church in a range of ways – through catechetics, encouraging and developing young vocations, and continuing to make the Christian faith visible to a generation which is otherwise largely absent from church’ (2018: 23).

McGrail and Sullivan (2007) offer a Roman Catholic perspective on chaplaincy, illuminating how chaplains can operate creatively in what they term the ‘interstitial spaces’, defined as ‘the crevices and gaps that can be found in any large organisation’ (2007: 89). Brown (2010) advocates a theology of Methodist chaplaincy as ‘wisdom in this place’, while Williams (2013) proposes the utility of Bonhoeffer’s notion of ‘religionless Christianity’ for chaplains in secular universities.

Rajput (2015) argues for the development of a distinctively Muslim understanding of chaplaincy. While appreciating how existing Christian models have enabled a wider range of chaplains to find orientation in the university, the time has come to encourage an authentically Muslim approach which emphasises the humanitarian aspects of care over an inherited sense that chaplaincy can be understood as an extension of God’s work.

In a general book on chaplaincy, applicable also to higher education chaplaincy, Threlfall-Holmes (2011: 118) lists Christian theological models for chaplaincy: ‘the missionary, the pastor, the incarnational or sacramental, the historical parish model’, and the prophetic model. Secular models are also listed: ‘the provider of pastoral care, the spiritual carer, the diversity model, the tradition/heritage model’ and ‘a “meta-model” that summarises many of these – the specialist service provider’. However, there is a tension within the Anglican church between what is termed ‘parish’ and ‘sector’ ministry, with many Anglican chaplains feeling their work is less valued by the Church than that of parish priests, Threlfall-Holmes and Newitt (2011a: xiv-xv) point out: ‘Chaplaincy…can be seen by the church hierarchy as not just on but beyond the margins of church life proper’. This sense or position of marginality in the church can be heightened for higher education chaplains by a sense of marginality in the university. But at the edges of these institutions, they are also bridge-builders to a diverse range of groups, as this report will show. Ryan (2018) revisits the models offered by Threlfall-Holmes (2011) and suggests additions: ‘cultist’ and ‘exile’ to the theological models; and ‘community mediator’ to the secular ones.

Within the set of theological essays offered by Caperon, Todd and Walters (2018) the question of mission is a common thread. A number of voices call into question the Church of England’s current approach under the banner of ‘Renewal and Reform’, judging its evangelistic emphasis to be too narrow in comparison with the broader conception of the Missio Dei aimed at ‘fullness of life’.

There may be no consensus on what the ‘best’ theologies of chaplaincy involve, but Smith (2015: 225) argues that university chaplaincy does need a theology, lest it become simply a form of well-being provision:

Without a well-developed theology, HEI chaplaincy will always be in a place of uncertainty. Chaplains will continue to spend time justifying their presence in the institution and their resourcing to the church,
INTRODUCTION

detracting from actual work or ministry... A well-developed theology will allow Christian chaplains to be confidently present in both settings... [I]t is possible to develop a theological understanding of Christian university chaplaincy which accommodates both the secular goals of the institution and the mission of the church... If the Church and chaplains retreat from publicly speaking about faith and theology there is the potential for it leading to the death of Christian chaplaincy within the university. If they develop a robust theology of chaplaincy, there is potential for benefit to church, institution, and chaplain.

Though these existing publications are helpful, especially in the theological models they offer, they tend not to be systematically evidence-based – the models seem to be based on general observations of the university or universities the author happens to be familiar with, and not on any systematic empirical evidence. This means that they are partial. Authors may be advocating models that do not work in practice, that do not take account of the low levels of religious literacy among university students and staff, or that have not kept pace with the changes in higher education in the 21st century.

This paucity of higher education chaplaincy research evidence and theological reflection needs to change. This report builds on the Faiths in Higher Education Chaplaincy study, presenting the findings of an in-depth, multi-method study of chaplaincy and how it is understood and experienced by university students.

Methods

After ethical approval was received, the Chaplains on Campus project took place in two stages:

• National mapping via structured telephone interviews,
• Local case studies conducted via:
  - Interviews with chaplains and faith advisors
  - Interviews with university managers
  - Interviews with local and national religious bodies responsible for managing chaplaincy
  - A survey of students who use chaplaincy services

Case studies were of five universities (four in England and one in Scotland): (1) one ‘traditional elite’ university (ancient research-intensive universities); (2) one ‘red brick’ university (established in urban areas in the nineteenth and early twentieth century to cater to serve the needs of industry and science); (3) one ‘1960s campus’ university (also known as ‘plate glass’ universities, established after the 1963 Robbins report recommending university expansion); (4) one ‘post-1992’ university (mostly former polytechnics granted university status in 1992, also known as ‘new’ universities, originally focusing more on vocational training but now offering a wide range of courses); and (5) one ‘Cathedrals Group’ university (the name given to a group of 16 universities established as teacher training colleges by the Anglican, Roman Catholic and Methodist churches in the nineteenth century, which, like the post-1992 universities, now offer a wider range of subjects). They represent the institutional diversity of the UK higher education sector, following Guest et al.’s (2013) typology, which built upon the work of Weller (2008) and Gilliat-Ray (2000).

To undertake the telephone interviews, a list of chaplains in each of the UK’s universities was constructed using websites and telephone calls to chaplaincies. This revealed a total of 1063 chaplains, of which five were excluded as we learned that they were no longer working in that role. Nearly two-thirds were Christian, and the next largest groups were Muslim and Jewish, as Figure 0.1 indicates.

8. Ethical approval was received from Coventry University. To protect those interviewed, all chaplains and universities have been anonymised.

9. Universities sometimes use ‘faith advisor’ rather than ‘chaplain’ for non-Christian staff performing a chaplaincy role, as we discuss in Chapter 1. What university faith advisors do is similar to what chaplains do, so for the purpose of selecting interviewees, we saw them as interchangeable terms.

10. These represent about 1000 people, as 44 chaplaincy roles were shared across different institutions and around 15 people worked in more than one institution.
We emailed the 1058, inviting them for a half an hour telephone interview at a mutually convenient time. Those who were the ‘lead chaplain’ in their institution, or if not the person best placed to answer additional questions about the role of chaplaincy in their university, took part in a longer interview. After four months, 374 chaplains had been interviewed: 367 general interviews, and 99 additional ‘lead chaplain’ interviews. General interviews asked about the chaplain and their work, while the lead chaplain interviews asked about chaplaincy within their own university, for example exact numbers of chaplains from different faith groups working as chaplains and numbers of chaplaincy rooms or spaces. Interviews were carried out by PhD student research assistants at Coventry University.

While this represents a large interview sample, arranging interviews with part-time and volunteer chaplains was challenging as many did not respond to attempts to contact them, meaning that volunteers and part-time chaplains and faith advisors are under-represented. As non-Christian chaplains are more likely to be unpaid and work fewer hours, they are underrepresented in the sample. Nevertheless, we secured sufficient interviews to compare the experiences of volunteers vs paid chaplains, and Christian vs non-Christian chaplains, in a statistically meaningful way.

Some types of university were less likely to agree to an interview. This means that our ‘whole sector’ data generated via the 99 lead chaplains interviews is more accurate for the Cathedrals Group (leads were interviewed at 15 of 16 universities), the red brick universities (14 out of 17) and the 1960s campus universities (19 out of 25), and less accurate for post-1992 universities (38 out of 61) and traditional elites (13 out of 21). The lower success interviewing traditional elite lead chaplains was largely because many were University of London colleges which were too small to have their own chaplain and shared chaplaincy with other colleges; this made it difficult to find a ‘lead’ to interview.\textsuperscript{11} The lower success at post-1992 universities was due to chaplains not responding to requests for interviews, universities not having a full-time chaplain, universities being very small or new, or not having a chaplain at all. We sought to interview chaplains at four private universities, but no chaplain existed. London also proved a challenging context: of 30 universities’ lead chaplains approached for interview, only 13 in London responded. Reasons for this are unknown.

The case studies in each university were undertaken via interviews with five university managers (including people from the senior management team, student services and the students union), four chaplains (from a range of faith

\textsuperscript{11} Where universities had no official ‘lead’ chaplain, and we estimate that around half of universities do not, the person who identified themselves as having the best overview or involvement in chaplaincy provided the information for their institution.
groups) and two local representatives of religion and belief organisations that manage chaplaincy (total: 55 semi-structured interviews in local areas). For the survey of students who use chaplaincy services, an online student survey was distributed in each university by the university circulating a link to the survey either by email to all students or within an email newsletter12, and then by chaplains circulating it to students they were in contact with, team members visiting each chaplaincy to distribute flyers and offering students the opportunity to fill it in then and there, and by requests to student religious societies to send the survey to their members. Finally, ten interviews were conducted with religion and belief organisations at national level who have responsibility either for governance of university chaplaincy (these included major Christian denominations, Jewish, Muslim and secular organisations) or who are recognised as authorities on chaplaincy (these included Sikh, Hindu and Buddhist representatives).

---

12. The link, with the subject line, ‘Have you ever used the services of the university chaplaincy? Please tell us about your experiences’, was sent to all students in all but one university. At that university, the other methods were used.
Chapter 1: The National Picture – Who are the UK’s university chaplains?

Findings from the 367 telephone interviews

Compared to the UK picture (see Figure 0.1), Christians were over-represented among our interviewees. They made up over three-quarters (77.1%) of interviewees (but constitute only two thirds of the national population of university chaplains).

![Figure 1.1: What is your religion? (% of the 367 chaplains interviewed)](image)

Direct comparison with Clines’ (2008) study can be made via our interviews with 99 lead chaplains, as these account for 99 universities, a number similar to Clines’ 103 lead chaplain interviews. This reveals some differences. Lead chaplains’ calculations for their universities revealed a total of 1032 chaplains, of whom 62.7% were Christian (including Quakers), 9.5% were Muslim, 7.9% Jewish, 5.3% Buddhist, 3.8% Hindu, 2.1% Sikh, 1.8% Baha’i and 6.6% ‘other’, as Table 1.1 shows.

13. Unless otherwise stated, in figures N (which stands for Number of responses) = 367, and missing responses (there were very few) are excluded from percentages.

14. ‘Any other religion’ includes five Baha’is, five Pagans, two humanists; one each was Daoist, spiritualist and affiliated with the Brahma Kumaris.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith or belief</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of all chaplains(^{15})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian (includes Anglican, Roman Catholic, Methodist, Orthodox, Baptist,</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal, International, Chinese, other Christian, Quaker)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baha’i</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (includes 16 humanist, 14 inter-faith, 14 pagan, and 24 others)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.1**: Religious affiliation of chaplains in 99 universities, 2017

Breaking down the ‘other’ category to make visible the largest of the ‘other’ groups reveals humanist (1.6%), inter-faith (1.4%) and Pagan (1.4%) chaplains. Distinguishing Quakers from the general Christian group reveals that Quakers constitute 3.7% of chaplaincy roles.

**Figure 1.2**: Religious affiliation of 1032 UK chaplaincy roles in 99 universities, 2017 (%)

NB: All named groups include at least 14 chaplaincy roles – others are combined as ‘other’

\(^{15}\) Percentages total 99.7% due to rounding.
From 2007 to 2017 there has been a diversification of the religious profile of chaplains: Christians remain the large minority, but proportions of Muslims, Buddhists, Hindus, Baha’is and, most notably, other religions and beliefs, have increased\(^\text{16}\). Clines included Quakers in the Christian figure, so we have done the same for comparison, despite the fact that an increasing number of Quakers do not identify as Christian;\(^\text{17}\) there were 38 Quaker chaplains (4% of the sample), so if they were not counted as Christian, the 2017 Christian percentage would be 59%. There was a large proportional increase, from 2% to 7%, of the ‘other’ group, with the largest groups being humanist, inter-faith and Pagan. This represents their increasing recognition as legitimate chaplaincy perspectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>2007 proportion</th>
<th>2017 proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baha’i</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.2: Religious affiliation of chaplains in 99 universities, 2007 and 2017**

From 2007 to 2017 there has been a diversification of the religious profile of chaplains: Christians remain the large minority, but proportions of Muslims, Buddhists, Hindus, Baha’is and, most notably, other religions and beliefs, have increased\(^\text{16}\). Clines included Quakers in the Christian figure, so we have done the same for comparison, despite the fact that an increasing number of Quakers do not identify as Christian;\(^\text{17}\) there were 38 Quaker chaplains (4% of the sample), so if they were not counted as Christian, the 2017 Christian percentage would be 59%. There was a large proportional increase, from 2% to 7%, of the ‘other’ group, with the largest groups being humanist, inter-faith and Pagan. This represents their increasing recognition as legitimate chaplaincy perspectives.

**Spread of chaplains across universities**

Chaplaincy provision differs across the university sub-sectors. A 2017 web search of chaplaincy websites revealed that the older the university sector, the more chaplains there were. The traditional elites had the most chaplains (an average of 13), then the red bricks (11.1), the 1960s campus universities (7.4), the post-1992 universities (5.5), then the Cathedrals Group (4.9). But this does not take into account the different sizes of the institutions. When the number of chaplains is compared to the number of students enrolled, the picture changes. The best chaplain to student ratio remains in the traditional elites, but the Cathedrals Group is in second place, followed by red bricks, then the 1960s campus universities, with chaplain numbers proportionally lowest at post-1992 universities.

---

16. In his 2007 report, Siddiqui remarks that there are “perhaps over 30 Muslim chaplains/advisors working in universities in England. Almost all of them, with only a few exceptions, are volunteers.” (2007: 46) Our lead chaplains survey conducted in 2017 produced a figure of 98 individuals, 26 of whom are paid. Notwithstanding the England/UK difference, which is probably only marginally significant given the vast majority of universities in the UK are located in England, there has been a threefold increase in the number of Muslim chaplains/fait advisors over this 10 year period, and an increase in the proportion paid for their work as chaplains. In 2007 Siddiqui expressed concern that Muslim chaplains are under-resourced in proportion to the amount of work they are called upon to do, including advising university authorities about Islam and responding to media outbursts about terrorism and fundamentalism in universities. While it is difficult to say whether today’s provision is sufficient, it has certainly increased significantly since his report was published.

17. Figures from a longitudinal study of British Quakers demonstrate a declining proportion identify as Christian, from 51.5% in 1990, to 45.5% in 2003, to 36.5% in 2013 (Dandelion, forthcoming).
### Table 1.3: Average number of chaplains, average FTE, paid FTE and chaplain-student ratio across five university types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Average no. of chaplains</th>
<th>Average full-time equivalent (FTE)</th>
<th>Average paid FTE</th>
<th>Chaplain: Students ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional elite</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1 to 1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red brick</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1 to 2180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s campus</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1 to 2994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-1992</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1 to 3043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedrals Group</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1 to 1439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking into account the different working hours of chaplains at each institution, which we discuss shortly, at least three-quarters of chaplaincy time given is paid for in all university types apart from 1960s campus universities, which has a paid FTE of 1.7 and an overall FTE of 3.4, so only 50% of time is funded. In Cathedrals Group universities, almost all (2.7 FTE out of 2.8) time is funded.

### Who are today's chaplains?

Of the 367 chaplains who took part in the general interview, 62.9% were male, 37.1% female and 0.3% (one person) identified as trans, non-binary or gender queer. Two-thirds (65.9%) were 45-54 or older, and while most were below 65, one in ten (10.9%) were 65 and over (and two were 85 and older). Women were younger and slightly more likely to be paid than men, suggesting that the world of chaplaincy is becoming more gender equal.

Chaplains are highly educated: 97.5% had at least a Bachelors’ degree and 26.5% a PhD. It is evident that 60.8% had undertaken religious training (e.g. were an ordained minister), and when split by religious group, the Christians were the most likely to have done so, but were no more likely to have had a university education. This reflects the professionalisation of religious leadership that has been evident in the UK for some time, the relative size of religious groups in the UK, and the fact that in the UK there are more recognised religious training schemes for Christians. Among lead chaplains this figure was higher still: 78 of the 99 (78.8%) had undertaken religious training. Asked if they held a chaplaincy-specific qualification, only 12.8% of all chaplains and 20.2% of lead chaplains said yes. This suggests that despite the existence of chaplaincy courses, the vast majority of chaplains have not been trained specifically as chaplains.

---

18. N = 362

19. P = < .001: 69.3% of Christians had undertaken religious training compared with 32.1% of non-Christians. Throughout the report, when reporting on statistical significance, the 0.05 significance level (p) is used (standard in social science research), which means that we can be 95% confident that findings have not occurred by chance.
Chaplains’ role title

Asked the title of their role, they gave an array of responses. As the picture below indicates, ‘chaplain’ was by far the most common, mentioned by 317 people. For a substantial number the word ‘chaplain’ stood alone or was accompanied by a generic term such as ‘University’ or ‘Duty’ or a term indicating their level of commitment or seniority, e.g. ‘Coordinating’, or Honorary’ or ‘Associate’ for volunteers. For 84 it was accompanied by a Christian denomination or grouping such as ‘Free Church chaplain’, with ‘Anglican chaplain’ and ‘Catholic chaplain’ the most common, followed by ‘Methodist’ chaplain. ‘Christian chaplain’ was rare, as the denomination was more likely to be mentioned, whereas for non-Christians termed chaplains, their religion was usually mentioned without denominational subdivisions: ‘Muslim chaplain’, ‘Jewish chaplain’ or ‘Sikh chaplain’. Minority faiths were more commonly called ‘chaplain’ than they were ‘faith advisor’, indicating that the originally Christian term ‘chaplain’ is becoming accepted for other faiths.

Of the other 50, 29 had titles with the word ‘advisor’ (mostly ‘faith advisor’, occasionally ‘religious advisor’), some preceded by the religion (e.g. ‘Buddhist faith advisor’, ‘Pentecostal advisor’). Several titles indicated a senior Christian role: ‘Dean of Chapel’, ‘Senior University Pastor’ or ‘Chapel Director’. The term ‘contact’ was also used by a few universities, usually for those who were less regular volunteers, for example ‘Quaker faith contact’ or ‘Belief contact’, as was ‘representative’, for example ‘Baha’i representative on chaplaincy team’.

The term ‘international’ appeared in the role title of seven people, e.g. ‘International chaplain’; this was usually used to refer to Christian chaplains who worked with international students. Five had ‘inter-faith’ in their title (e.g. ‘University Chaplain and Inter-faith advisor’), six ‘multi-faith’ (e.g. ‘Multi-faith chaplain’); all but one of these identified their religion as Christian, suggesting that the title is not a reflection of the chaplain’s religious identity, more as a sign to those the chaplain works with.

Figure 1.3: Chaplains’ role title, a word cloud

---

20. The word cloud includes words mentioned at least three times, so where job titles contain university names, these are generally excluded.
Overall, Christianity remains dominant in the titles of chaplains’ roles, but minority religions are being described as chaplains, not just faith advisors, and a minority of universities prefer other titles than chaplain, such as ‘faith advisor’. A very small number use the term ‘multi’ or ‘inter’ faith. There are no clear differences between the five university types in the job titles used. There seem to be at least two, overlapping, models operating: 1) chaplaincy located within a specific tradition but aimed at all (traditionally the Anglican model), and 2) chaplaincy located with a specific tradition and intended to serve those who affiliate with that tradition.

Self-described religious identity

The question ‘How would you describe your religious identity?’ followed the fixed choice ‘What is your religion?’ question. This elicited a wide range of responses, as participants were able to describe themselves however they wished. Christians often described their denomination (Anglican or Church of England, Roman Catholic and Methodist being most prominent), but also their churchmanship, for example ‘evangelical’, or ‘liberal’. See Figure 1.4 below.

Working hours and conditions: are chaplains paid?

The majority of chaplaincy roles are voluntary. When lead chaplains were asked to state the approximate time commitment of every one of their chaplaincy staff and whether they were paid, this revealed that of 1032 chaplaincy appointments, 63.4% of chaplaincy roles are voluntary (654 people), and 36.6% (378) are paid.

The average (mean) university has 10.4 chaplains or faith advisors, 3.8 of them paid and 6.6 unpaid. This might seem generous provision, but as many of these roles are not full time or paid, chaplaincy provision is less than this. Calculating a full-time equivalent figure reveals the true amount of chaplaincy provision in each university. The mean FTE was 3.3, of which 2.4 was paid and 0.9 of time was given voluntarily.

Figure 1.4: Chaplains’ descriptions of their religious identity

21. 55.9% of the 367 said they were paid for their work and 44.1% said they were volunteers. However, due to volunteers being under-represented among interviewees, this figure should not be cited as representative of the sector. The more accurate figure comes from the 99 lead chaplain interviews, because it represents a larger proportion of the sector. These figures are not necessarily representative of the whole sector, as some of the universities where no one could be found to interview (especially post-1992 universities – see earlier section) were places with poorer chaplaincy provision.

22. FTEs were calculated as follows: working over 30 hours was classed as full-time (1.0), working 5-30 hours was classed as half-time (0.5), working regularly but below 5 hours was classed as 0.07 (estimating an average of 2.6 hours in a 37.5 hour week) and working ‘occasionally’ as 0.02 (estimating an average of three-quarters of an hour per week). These were then added up to produce a total FTE figure for each university and for each religion or belief group. These are estimations of time, so will not be entirely accurate (for example, some people who work occasionally do an hour every fortnight, while others attend only one or two events per year).
Chaplaincy appointments summary based on 99 ‘lead chaplain’ telephone interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In 99 universities</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Mean per university</th>
<th>FTE total</th>
<th>Mean FTE per university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All chaplains / faith advisors</td>
<td>1032(^{23})</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>330.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid chaplains / faith advisors</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>238.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary chaplains / faith advisors</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.4: Number of chaplains/faith advisors across UK HE sector: total, total FTE, mean average per university and mean average FTE per university

The average (mean) UK university has 10.4 chaplains:

The time they offer equates to 3.3 full-time equivalent (FTE) roles.

2.4 FTE of chaplain time is paid and 0.9 is given voluntarily.

Across 144 universities, the 0.9 full-time equivalent of volunteer time constitutes around £4.5 million of volunteer labour each year\(^ {24}\)

Volunteer chaplains give a huge amount of time to universities. Universities are receiving a substantial amount of chaplaincy work for free, from volunteers and religious organisations. This offer is surely unmatched by any other volunteering activity within universities. Volunteer chaplains are not necessarily people who can afford not to do paid work (for example, they are not all retired with time on their hands); instead, they are people juggling other responsibilities. Indeed, asked ‘If chaplaincy is not your full-time job, do you have another paid occupation’, 57.4\% said yes.\(^ {25}\)

---

\(^{23}\) This sum and all subsequent FTE calculations excludes eight ‘other Christian’ appointments and one ‘other Jewish’ appointments, for whom the lead chaplain did not state hours of work or pay.

\(^{24}\) The figure is given for 144 universities rather than the larger 167. The 23 excluded from the calculation includes many new, small and private providers that we did not include in the list of universities we sampled from – the vast majority of these appear to have no chaplaincy. The £4.5 million is derived from the assumption that a modest chaplain salary of £25k, including overheads and pension, would cost a university £35k. At 0.9 FTE given voluntarily, 90\% of this amount (£31,500) was then multiplied by 144 universities.

\(^{25}\) N = 329.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion or belief group</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Voluntary</th>
<th>% of the 238.3 FTE paid time</th>
<th>% of the 92.6 FTE volunteer time</th>
<th>% of the FTE per faith group that is voluntary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baha’i</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>265.6</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>200.3</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-faith</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other New Religious Movements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>330.9</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>238.3</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1.5: Chaplain roles in 99 universities by paid/voluntary status and religion or belief group (Christians combined)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christian denomination</th>
<th>All</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>112.6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaker</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.6: Christian chaplain roles in 99 universities by paid/voluntary status and denomination
Which chaplains are paid?

Figures 1.5 and 1.6 show the distribution of paid and unpaid time by religion.

Figure 1.5: % of total paid chaplaincy time worked by each religion or belief group (in 99 universities)

Figure 1.6: % of total volunteer chaplaincy time given by each religion or belief group (in 99 universities)
The dominance of Christians in paid roles is clear – they make up 84.1% of paid chaplain time. Volunteer time is spread across the different groups in a much more diverse manner, with a reduced 70.5% of volunteer time given by Christians. Generally, the smaller and/or least established the religious group, the more likely it is that its chaplains work without payment. In the larger and longer-established religious groups, chaplains’ time is mostly paid for. Interestingly, as Figure 1.7 indicates, the majority of Muslim and inter-faith chaplaincy time is paid for; since Islam remains a minority religion, and inter-faith is not a specific religious group, it might be assumed that those chaplains would find it difficult to find remuneration. However, this is not or no longer the case. (It is likely also that ‘inter-faith’ chaplains may have that role as their key remit but be employed by Christian organisations).

The fact that university chaplaincy can be called multi-faith while being led by a full-time paid chaplain who is often Anglican, reflects historical connections between the Church of England and universities. It also serves as an institutional expression of an Anglican orientation to ministry, which is inclusive, pastoral and conceives of the campus as analogous to the parish. The fact that universities with no formal church links or that have links with free churches often still have an Anglican as lead chaplain is a reflection of the Establishment status enjoyed by the Church of England, so that an Anglican appointment is often the default choice.

Why Christian churches are much more likely to pay chaplains than other religion or belief groups relates to several factors. First, chaplaincy roles are defined according to conventions that reflect an era when Christianity was more dominant than it is now; this might include trusts having been established some time ago to support chaplaincy provision. Second, the Christian denominations, especially the Church of England and Roman Catholic Church, are larger and better resourced. Third, the Church of England’s established status accords it a more prominent position, so that a university would be more likely to turn to it than to other denominations when in need of a chaplain. Fourth, there is a popular perception that Church of England clergy are more inclusive in orientation than some other denominations, and this perception of inclusiveness would be attractive to university managers.

Nonetheless, the churches’ financial resources are shrinking, meaning that funding as many chaplains as occurs currently may not be sustainable in the longer term. Indeed, during our research we heard of instances where Christian chaplains’ posts were under threat because denominations could no longer afford them.

These data paint a picture of a divided workforce of chaplains: paid, full-timers, who are almost all Christian, and volunteer part-timers who span the religious groups.

26. Some universities have historical links with the free or Roman Catholic churches. It is important to note that Free Church chaplains, for example Baptists, may be in roles that are ecumenical and not denomination-specific; some of these roles may require a church affiliation with ecumenical bodies Churches Together in England or Churches Together in Britain and Ireland.
Figure 1.7: Proportion of voluntary chaplaincy time, as a percentage of total time given by each faith group in 99 universities
Who pays chaplains?

The stark difference in the situation of Christian chaplains compared to non-Christian chaplains is revealed in the responses of the 367 to the question of who pays them, as Figure 1.9 shows.

**Figure 1.8:** Total number of chaplains/faith advisors and FTE, by faith group

**Figure 1.9:** Proportion of chaplains receiving remuneration from different sources, by religious category (% of 367 chaplains interviewed)
Of the 367 we spoke to, 77.4% of non-Christian chaplains were volunteers, compared to 30.4% of Christians. However, this differs by religion, and although some of these groups are too small for us to be sure, there is a statistically significant difference between Christian and non-Christian chaplains. After Christians, the religious group with the largest proportion of chaplains being paid are Jews (54.5% are paid), followed by Muslims (29.4%). Muslim chaplains are more likely than any other group including Christians to be paid by their university. Jewish chaplains are paid by Jewish organisations, not universities.

Religious bodies are the larger funders of chaplaincy, with 27.5% of chaplains receiving a salary or stipend from one or more religious body. Only 22.6% chaplains are paid solely by the university. A further 6.8% are paid jointly by the university and a religious body. In a very few cases (1.9%) there is another arrangement, for instance a local trust.

The vast majority of the 83 chaplains we spoke to receiving pay from universities are Christian; Muslims account for five, Sikhs for one and Buddhists for one. Of course, those we spoke to were only around a third of all chaplains. Overall, universities are not investing as much financially in chaplains from other faiths. Instead, these people are either volunteers or paid by a religious organisation.

**Which religious organisations pay chaplains?**

136 chaplains named a religious organisation as providing their pay. The major funder of chaplaincy is the Church of England, followed by the Roman Catholic and Methodist churches. The next largest group are funded by an ecumenical arrangement, for instance a free churches trust (such as Methodist, Baptist and URC combined), an Anglican and Methodist partnership or a university Christian chaplaincy trust. Next comes the Orthodox Jewish organisation University Jewish Chaplaincy, which is the most important chaplaincy body serving Jewish students in universities and closely linked with the student body University Jewish Students. University Jewish Chaplaincy’s ability to pay chaplains depends, the representative interviewed explained, on ‘well-wishers and organisations who approve and support our work’; ‘funding is very, very difficult’, the interviewee explained, expressing a desire for universities to co-fund some of their posts:

> What we would want is the universities to recognise that they’re providing a tremendous benefit to Jewish students and probably more broadly, so the mental health, wellbeing and really what we need is the universities to recognise that they should be paying for probably forty or fifty percent of this.

As the table indicates, the remaining funders are smaller denominations within Christianity, one Jewish organisation, Chabad on Campus, and Humanists UK. This means there are only three religion/belief groups (Christians, Jews and humanists) who fund chaplains.

---

27. *P* < 0.001.

28. *P* = 0.001.

29. Perhaps this is related to the Preventing Violent Extremism agenda, which seems to have been one factor in why universities have started employing Muslim chaplains.
Table 1.7: Number of interviewed chaplains paid exclusively by each religion or belief organisation.

Remuneration by university type

There are large statistically-significant differences in whether chaplains are paid and by whom, by type of university, as Figure 1.10 shows.30

Figure 1.10: Chaplains’ remuneration, by type of university

30. P < 0.001.
In the traditional elite and Cathedrals Groups, being paid by the university is the most common situation, with figures highest for the Cathedrals Group, where there is also the lowest ‘no remuneration’ figure. Cathedrals Group institutions therefore invest the most financially in (Christian) chaplains. Traditional elite universities usually have a Christian (generally Anglican) history, chapels and many years of chaplains being part of their tradition, especially in collegiate universities such as Oxford and Cambridge, so funding of chaplains is still embedded within these institutions. Receiving no payment is the most common option in the red brick, 1960s campus and post-1992 universities, reflecting their secular foundation; in these universities, chaplaincy was often added later. As Gilliat-Ray (2000: 28) notes, ‘In 1952, there were just eight university chaplains outside Oxford and Cambridge, of which only three were full time. By 1985 most universities, polytechnics and colleges of higher education had some kind of Anglican chaplaincy provision.’ Where chaplains in red brick, 1960s campus and post-1992 universities are funded, it is usually by religious organisations, who have, it seems, steered in to fill the gap.

**Should universities pay chaplains?**

Universities’ reliance on volunteer chaplains presents a challenge. Universities in England and Wales are expected to offer some sort of chaplaincy support for students. The 2015 Preventing Violent Extremism guidance for higher education providers in England and Wales indicates:

> RHEBs ['Relevant Higher Education Bodies'] have a clear role to play in the welfare of their students and we would expect there to be sufficient chaplaincy and pastoral support available for all students.

As part of this, we would expect the institution to have clear and widely available policies for the use of prayer rooms and other faith-related facilities. These policies should outline arrangements for managing prayer and faith facilities (for example an oversight committee) and for dealing with any issues arising from the use of the facilities.\(^{31}\)

Equality legislation requires (public) universities to act to work to eliminate religion- or belief-based discrimination and harassment, and support religious diversity and good relations between people of different faiths.\(^{32}\) Yet universities are relying on volunteers’ good will, and funding from resource-poor religious groups, to enable this to happen at the current level.

There may be advantages of using volunteers as chaplains. It reduces costs for universities. It may give chaplains autonomy to follow their own ideas about how chaplaincy should be done, and greater freedom from accountability to university constraints (although as the next chapters of this report show, universities are increasingly wishing to have greater input or control over chaplaincy, not less). But relying on volunteer chaplains has major disadvantages. It puts pressure on volunteers, meaning those able to volunteer are only those who have resources to do so. It may prevent chaplaincy becoming professionalised, since a consistent standard of work cannot be expected from people who have no contractual tie to the universities. Relying on volunteers prevents chaplaincy being a viable employment option for those from minority religions who do not have systems in place to pay for chaplains. Moreover, we cannot assume that the religious bodies who currently fund chaplains – principally the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church, the Methodist Church and University Jewish Chaplaincy – will continue to be able to pay chaplains, so what will happen then?\(^{33}\)

**Does being paid matter for chaplains’ work?**

What implications does being paid or not hold for chaplains’ work? First, if they are paid they work longer hours – obvious, perhaps, as few people would be able to work long hours without pay. Second, it affects their satisfaction with their university and religious organisation, and, as Chapter 5 shows, it affects their ability to have or observe impact: those who are paid and in full-time note more impact. In terms of satisfaction, those who are paid feel most

---


32. The 2010 public sector equality duty requires them to ‘have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- advance equality of opportunity between different groups, and
- foster good relations between different groups.’ (EHRc 2014: 59-60)

33. Siddiqui (2007) makes the same point about whether the local Muslim community should pay for Muslim university chaplaincy. The instability and unpredictability of this resource over time is one reason why he rejects this option, suggesting instead that universities should pay Muslim chaplains. As he comments, ‘the conclusion that I have reached is that the chaplains/advisors do provide a service to the university, and therefore it is the university that should pay for that service; and that chaplains/advisors having a secure and reliable income will in the long term help students and staff at the university.’ (2007: 47)
appreciated. Asked ‘How satisfied are you with the support you receive from university management?’ those who are paid are more satisfied – 76.6% say they are satisfied or very satisfied compared to 53.3% of those who volunteer. Asked how satisfied they are with the support from their religious organisation, there is little or no correlation between whether they are paid and whether they are satisfied with their religious organisation. But those who are paid by their religious organisation are more likely to be satisfied by it than those who are not paid, or those are paid by the university. In other words, paying a chaplain brings loyalty towards and satisfaction with whoever is doing the paying.

What other resources do universities and religion and belief organisations provide for chaplaincy?

Being paid is not the only way in which chaplains can be resourced by their universities and religion and belief organisations. Within universities, support for training and development and practical resources for chaplains to do their jobs such as administrative support, travel expenses and line management, are important indicators of the degree to which universities support chaplaincy.

Support for training and development

Almost three-quarters (73.9%) of chaplains said they attended training and development to support their chaplaincy role at least annually (26.1% said they did not). Christians were slightly more likely to attend training than non-Christians, but whether or not they were paid was a stronger predictor of attending training – paid chaplains were more likely to attend training than volunteer chaplains. 55% of unpaid chaplains attended training annually compared to 87% of paid chaplains.34 This suggests that paying chaplains improves the quality of their chaplaincy work, as it enables them to have funds and opportunities to enhance their skills. Asked what form that training takes, chaplains selected in roughly equal numbers ‘a course/workshop at your university’, ‘a course/workshop run by your religion or belief organisation’ and ‘a course/workshop about university chaplaincy’. One in five has a mentor or work coach.

Asked whether their university provided access to a series of resources, chaplains responded as Table 1.8 shows.35

Table 1.8: % of chaplains provided by their universities with a range of resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>% of Chaplains Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel expenses</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development and training</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplaincy staff and volunteers</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT or phone equipment</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An activities budget</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A line manager</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. P < 0.001.
35. Table 1.8 represents just what universities provide chaplains with. 237 of the 367 had a line manager; these managers included lead university chaplains, heads of student services, external religion and belief organisations, and a range of other arrangements.
The chaplains who were most likely to have access to these resources were Christian and paid. For example, in the case of IT or phone equipment, which was provided to nearly two-thirds of chaplains by their institution, 82.9% of paid chaplains had it, but only half that number of volunteer chaplains (40.4%) did. Given that these resources are inexpensive and help chaplains to do their jobs, it is disappointing that the majority of volunteer chaplains do not have university-facilitated access to them, and instead have to fund them themselves or ask their religious organisation.

Consistently less than 50% of volunteer chaplains are given access by their university to IT or phone equipment (40.4%), travel expenses (27.8%), administrative support (45%), staff development and training (43.7%), chaplaincy staff and volunteers (45%), an activities budget (25.8%). 53.6% are given a line manager.

But resources are not simply for chaplains themselves (enabling them to do their jobs better); in their non-remunerative form, they include human resources (staff and volunteers), staff development resources (training), physical space to plan or do chaplaincy work and for religious student groups to meet.

Chaplaincy spaces in universities: an overview

Most university chaplaincies (85.9%) serve one university. Those serving more were mostly in large cities, with a red brick and post-1992 university sharing chaplaincy provision.

Chaplaincy nomenclature – shifting from Christian language?

Asked what the chaplaincy service was called, all but about a dozen of the 99 included the word ‘chaplaincy’ – a slight reduction from Clines (2008: 8-9) finding that 92% did so ten years previously. Often the name was simply ‘The chaplaincy’, sometimes with another phrase such as ‘Chaplaincy and faith advice’. The use of ‘multi-faith’ has risen from one in ten in Clines’ study to a fifth; other prominent words used, mostly alongside ‘chaplaincy’, were ‘multi-faith’ (in 21 universities), ‘faith’ (15 universities) and ‘spirituality’ (5 universities). Examples were: ‘spirituality and faith centre’ or ‘multi-faith chaplaincy’. Post-1992 universities had the greatest diversity in chaplaincy nomenclature; perhaps as newer institutions they felt less tied to previous naming conventions. Overall, compared with ten years ago, there has been a small shift away from Christian language towards terminology indicating religious and spiritual diversity.

Faith spaces and rooms on campus

An average university\(^{36}\) has:

One prayer space for every 3,524 students

4.9 prayer spaces

6.4 religious student societies

which represent 4.5 different religions

---

\(^{36}\) Based on interviews with 99 lead chaplains.
There are differences in the amount of provision, differences that become clear when a ratio of spaces to students is calculated. The most abundant space for prayer and worship for students is at Cathedrals Group universities, followed by traditional elites, 1960s campuses, post-1992 universities, with red bricks having the smallest amount.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional elite</th>
<th>Red brick</th>
<th>1960s campus</th>
<th>Post-1992 university</th>
<th>Cathedrals Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average number of spaces of prayer &amp; worship</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average ratio of spaces for prayer &amp; worship to students in universities 2016-17</td>
<td>1 space for 2,874 students</td>
<td>1 for 5,550 students</td>
<td>1 for 3,026 students</td>
<td>1 for 4,392 students</td>
<td>1 for 1,421 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.9: Provision of prayer and worship spaces across five university types**

**Organised prayer and worship on campus**

A collective act of Christian worship takes place in 80.8% of universities on a weekly basis, mostly organised by the chaplaincy, with no major differences between types of university. More variation exists for Muslim Friday prayers: these happen in three-quarters of the universities, but much less in Cathedrals Group universities (they happen in only 40.0%, compared to 94.4% of 1960s campuses, 84.6% of traditional elites, 76.3% of post-1992 universities and 71.4% of red bricks). In two-thirds of cases, Muslim Friday prayers are not organised by the chaplaincy – very different from the situation with Christian worship. The question of who organises them was not asked, but conversations with chaplains suggest that the student Islamic Society often organises them. At the post-1992 university case study, for example, Friday prayers took place in the university’s large Muslim prayer room (known to some as ‘the mosque’), led by a local imam who was paid part-time by the university to be its Muslim chaplain.

**Religion and belief student societies**

Numbers of religion and belief-related student societies is another indicator of the level of religious provision. An average university, according to the ‘lead’ chaplain’s reporting, has 6.4 religious student societies, which represent 4.5 different religions; the number of religions is lower due largely to large numbers of Christian societies. At least one Christian society was found at 99% of universities. At least one Muslim society was found at 86.9% of universities, a Jewish society at 50.5%, a Hindu at 48.5%, Sikh at 44.4%, Buddhist at 34.3%, humanist at 33.3%, inter-faith at 18.2%, Pagan at 13.1%, Baha’i at 12.1%, LDS/ Mormon at 3.0% and Jain at 2.0% of universities. 5.1% of universities have a society representing another faith – these five include Falun Gong and Krishna Consciousness (which some would categorise as Hindu). However, religious student society provision stems from student initiative – societies are started and run by students, so it is not the chaplaincy or university’s role to provide religious societies. The numbers of societies for minority religious students was lower than average at Cathedrals Group and post-1992 universities, with few such societies at Cathedrals Group universities. Some of this is explainable

---

37. Lack of prayer facilities and Friday (jum’a) prayer provision were cited by Siddiqui as two key care concerns raised by Muslim students he spoke to for his 2007 report (Siddiqui 2007: 99). Neither Siddiqui nor Clines (2008) measured the number of universities hosting Friday prayers, so while it is probably fair to assume this is a considerable increase on past provision, it is impossible to cite a precise measure of growth. On Muslim prayer spaces, see below.

38. See forthcoming study of religious student societies by Simon Perfect and Ben Ryan at Theos and Kristin Aune.
in socioeconomic terms – Cathedrals Group and post-1992 universities are more likely to attract students of lower parental income levels, who are more likely to live at home and juggle paid work and study, having less time for student societies.

Cathedrals Group universities may have excellent chaplaincy provision, but with poor facilities for prayer or mixing with students of the same minority faith (57.1% of Cathedrals Group universities do not have a permanent Muslim prayer room, almost double the 30.4% average of the whole sector39), chaplaincy provision may seem meagre to Cathedrals Group students from non-Christian religions. Moreover, desire to attend a university where there are significant numbers of minority religious students (or students from their particular minority religion) may attract students from minority faiths to more religiously diverse types of university such as red brick or post-1992 universities in large cities; as data collected for the CUE project (Guest et al. 2013: 56-7) demonstrated, the Cathedrals Group had the lowest proportion of ethnic minority students. This is something for Cathedrals Group institutions to reflect upon: how friendly to faith might they appear to students from minority religions? Are they content for their religious provision to remain mainly Christian, if this risks discouraging students from other faiths from choosing the university or if it models a Christian inclusivity which some students will interpret as exclusivist instead? As noted in a study of class and aspiration amongst Christian students (Guest and Aune 2017), religious provision is a factor (alongside academic aspirations and family influence) in religious students’ university choices.

Funding for chaplaincy facilities

Two-thirds (67.4%) of lead chaplains said new funding had been sought for provision for students and staff of faith in the last five years, the same proportion as reported by Clines (2008: 23-24). Slightly more (71.1%), but almost all the same universities, said new funding had been received in the same period, more than the 53% reported by Clines. Funding had been received in all types of university, indicating that the commitment across the sector to increase or maintain chaplaincy provision that Clines reported on has increased further in the past decade. 45.5% had received funding for estates or chaplaincy space, 40.4% for staffing, 28.3% for prayer resources, 30.3% for occasional or one-off events, 23.2% for regular events, 19.2% for education or training, 12.1% for other. Chaplains gave many examples of this provision: at one generous extreme, a new million pound centre, at the other, a doormat for the Muslim prayer room. Provision for chaplaincy space included a kosher kitchen, a memorial space for remembrance and the Holocaust and wudu (Muslim pre-prayer washing) facilities. Staffing funds supported, for instance, Muslim chaplains. Funds were given for buying goods to celebrate festivals, for example Indian sweets, or for religious literature to put in prayer rooms. This level of investment is encouraging, although it does not always come from the university.

Asked if they wanted to make any other general comments, lead chaplains often mentioned that funding was hard-won. Some chaplains made positive comments, including a traditional elite chaplain’s comment ‘I love my job!’. A 1960s campus university chaplain said that chaplains are treated very well by the university, who have no obligation to provide for them, yet do so generously. Others operated in challenging contexts. In one red brick university the lead chaplain commented that no real university funding for staffing existed, yet the university expected the chaplains to abide by and implement policies without giving them the funds they needed to do their job. There was an ‘anti-religious feeling’ among university managers, who did not understand what chaplaincy was, as discussed in Chapter 2, and the situation differed from the more faith-friendly NHS, where the chaplain worked previously. The churches are generous in funding chaplaincy, the chaplain said, so the university should meet them half way. In a post-1992 university the chaplain talked about being a Christian chaplaincy caught within the university’s desire to have a multi-faith chaplaincy. Because the Christian community offered much more support to chaplaincy than the other religious groups did, the chaplain argued, it was hard to implement multi-faith chaplaincy.

Certain types of university resource chaplains better. There are big differences between resources offered by traditional elite and Cathedrals Group universities, who are much more likely to provide pay and resources, and red brick, 1960s campuses and post-1992 universities, who are much less likely to. It might be expected that universities who do not pay chaplains make up for the lack of pay in other ways. But this is not the case apart from, to some extent, in the 1960s campus universities, as Table 1.9 shows, where ‘more’ and the colour green represents better provision than average and ‘less’ and the colour orange represents worse than average provision.

In the case of physical space for chaplaincy, the mean average number of worship and prayer spaces for chaplaincy at traditional elite universities is 6.5. 1960s campus universities have 5.6, higher than Cathedrals Groups who have 4.9 and red bricks who have 4.4. Post-1992 universities provide the smallest amount of dedicated chaplaincy space, an average of 4.2 spaces.

39. The proportion of universities with at least one permanent Muslim prayer room has risen slightly from 65% ten years ago (Clines 2008: 109) to 69.6%.
### Table 1.10: Range of resources provided by universities to chaplains and to religion on campus more generally, by university type, highlighting where universities provide more or less than the national figure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF RESOURCE (of the 367 chaplains)</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Traditional elite</th>
<th>Red brick</th>
<th>1960s campus</th>
<th>Post-1992 university</th>
<th>Cathedrals Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay (by university alone or jointly with a religious body)</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>MORE 47.6%</td>
<td>LESS 5.5%</td>
<td>LESS 16.7%</td>
<td>LESS 26.9%</td>
<td>MORE 70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel expenses</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>MORE 56%</td>
<td>LESS 26%</td>
<td>MORE 44.4%</td>
<td>LESS 35.6%</td>
<td>MORE 73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>MORE 58.3%</td>
<td>LESS 47.9%</td>
<td>MORE 68.1%</td>
<td>LESS 46.2%</td>
<td>MORE 64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development &amp; training</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>MORE 70.2%</td>
<td>LESS 45.2%</td>
<td>MORE 65.3%</td>
<td>LESS 54.8%</td>
<td>MORE 88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplaincy staff &amp; volunteers</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>LESS 47.6%</td>
<td>LESS 38.4%</td>
<td>MORE 58.3%</td>
<td>LESS 45.2%</td>
<td>MORE 73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT or phone equipment</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>MORE 66.7%</td>
<td>LESS 52.1%</td>
<td>MORE 80.6%</td>
<td>LESS 56.7%</td>
<td>MORE 85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An activities budget</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>MORE 58.3%</td>
<td>LESS 28.8%</td>
<td>MORE 59.7%</td>
<td>LESS 41.3%</td>
<td>MORE 79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A line manager</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>MORE 67.9%</td>
<td>LESS 38.4%</td>
<td>MORE 72.2%</td>
<td>MORE 68.3%</td>
<td>MORE 85.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF RESOURCE (of the 99 universities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prayer spaces to students ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 permanent Muslim prayer space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 3 different religions represented by student societies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. All p < 0.001 except staff and volunteers (p < 0.01), administrative support (p < 0.05), Muslim prayer space (p < 0.05) and prayer spaces for students, which was calculated separately so no p value can be obtained.

41. Clines’ study found that, among the 111 universities who provided data for his report, 67.6% had at least one permanent Muslim prayer space, so our measure of 69.6% does not suggest a very significant increase over 10 years. A more granular analysis reveals that the proportion of universities with 2 or more permanent Muslim prayer spaces has increased from 19.8% to 32% (see Clines 2008: 16). This may suggest increased provision is occurring in HEIs which were already addressing this need, whereas those which were not remain less responsive. One possible explanation for this would be that universities that have in the past recruited a significant proportion of Muslim students are recruiting even more now, and that these institutions are responding by enhancing existing provision of dedicated prayer space.
The superior resourcing of traditional elite and Cathedrals Group universities can be explained by their historical connection to the churches and their trust deeds, while the inferior resourcing of the other three groups can be explained by their secular foundation, despite moves towards recognising the newer multi-faith context. Having secular foundations means a variety of things, however, and what it meant historically may not be what it means today. For some universities, secular means ‘religion-free’ or unfriendly to faith, but for some, it means ‘faith-rich’, open to all, not restricting admission to those passing religious tests; both UCL and Owens College in Manchester (which became the University of Manchester) held the faith-rich interpretation at their foundation. The fact that 1960s campus universities stand out in these groups as offering superior non-pay resources may be attributable to geography: located away from, at the edges of, towns and cities, there are limited existing town or city places of worship or religious resources to point students to, so demand from students has necessitated the creation of bespoke ones. In contrast, red brick universities and post-1992 universities are often located in cities with an existing supply of churches and other religious spaces, so students can be directed to those. The fact that secular-foundation universities have made these adaptions shows that they are attempting to accommodate religious requests.

42. Thank you to Stephen Heap for this insight.
Chapter 2: Approaches to Chaplaincy – How is university chaplaincy conceived and understood?

This chapter seeks to explore how chaplaincy is conceived by those who influence and shape its practice. It begins with chaplains themselves, drawing upon our telephone survey of 367 chaplains thus giving this discussion a firm empirical base. Next, we move to our case study universities mapping how chaplains’ conception of their purpose matches that of university managers responsible for chaplaincy, local religious sponsors of chaplaincy, and a range of national, coordinating figures in religion and belief organisations. Student views are also analysed. A good deal of consensus is uncovered between chaplains and university managers concerning what chaplains should do and the personal characteristics required to achieve it. However, managers generally appear to view chaplains from the ‘outside’ as performers of certain functions, rather than also appreciating the existential challenge of holding one’s integrity of faith alongside service of the university of which they are a part.  

How do chaplains conceive of their primary aim?

‘In brief, what do you think the primary aim of chaplaincy is?’ was a question we put to the 367 chaplains interviewed by telephone. The questions were available in advance, but we suspect many participants, due to time constraints, elected to provide their answers more or less spontaneously. In the main, their answers are immediate and concise, ranging from one to three sentences. Consequently, these responses have the merit of being an authentic window onto the thoughts and motifs foremost in the minds of chaplains that guide their everyday work; we are hearing what a significant cross-section of chaplains actually think. In providing an analysis of answers chaplains gave, every effort has been made to allow the categories used below to arise organically from the words and phrases captured in the interviews.

The question concerns ‘primary aim’. Where chaplains listed more than one aim, the first to be mentioned was used in analysis (except where the tenor of the response moves in another direction), so these aims are not exhaustive of a chaplain’s work (chaplains will have multiple aims) or exclusive. For example, what has been termed ‘Presence’ might lead into pastoral work, and the understanding gained through pastoral encounter with students and staff into prophetic questioning of the institution. Nevertheless, asking about primary aim does reveal, as we shall see, a statistically significant difference by type of university, by the religious identity of chaplains, and by the pay and hours worked by chaplains. Seven categories of primary aim are identified and described below, in order of the proportion of chaplains’ responses they contain.

Pastoral (33%)

A pastoral aim, at fractionally under one third of responses, constitutes the single largest category. In expressing this aim, it is the term ‘pastoral’ that is deployed most frequently, an expression widely associated with chaplaincy. However, the contemporary language of ‘wellbeing’, used by and of university support systems, appears to be gaining currency among chaplains, who also used the language of being a ‘listening ear’; of engaging in ‘non-judgemental listening’; promoting ‘human flourishing’ and ‘welfare’. Some respondents spoke as if their role is essentially reactive, ‘aa being available to be used: ‘[a] facility for students to use should they feel the need’ (Sikh, Cathedrals Group), or ‘[s]omeone for people to turn to if they need help and guidance’ (Muslim, red brick). Others offer a more active expression: ‘[s]upporting staff and students to achieve their goals spiritually, emotionally, academically – to become who they want to become’ (Christian, 1960s campus). This last response uses the language of person-centred counselling; this is not an isolated occurrence: ‘To be a support which is familiar to the person to whom you are reaching out. Listening without prejudice to enable self-belief and allowing them to find the answers that are already within’ (Christian Orthodox, 1960s campus). Chaplains also seek to express something that distinguishes their offering from other university support systems: ‘[t]o offer immediate support to

43. There is wisdom in Threlfall-Holmes’s (2011: 118) distinction between theological and secular models for chaplaincy. However, whether ‘specialist service provider’ succeeds as an overall integrating term is less clear.

44. In addition, a small proportion (1.4%) of responses fell outside of these categories, these covering a range of other emphases. As the numbers involved are so small, they are not discussed further here.
students in times of need before they can access the formal channels, e.g. before counselling sessions. The chaplains are the first point of contact’ (Methodist, 1960s campus). Another chaplain speaks of being ‘mobile’ and able to reach ‘all parts of the university’. Distinctiveness can also be a question of motivation and understanding: ‘[s]howing God’s compassionate care to whoever comes to the door’ (Free Church, post-1992). How to maintain one’s integrity as a person of faith and belief, and yet offer something to all, is a live question. Helpfully, one chaplain suggests: ‘Chaplaincy is about finding the meeting point between the needs and priorities of the university and the core values held within the Chaplaincy team…these meeting points would change over time: welfare, inclusion and diversity, sustainability — these three are present right now’ (Anglican, red brick). Later, we will return to this question of the authentic mediation of values between chaplaincy and the university.

Religious (18%)

‘Religious’ refers to facilitating religious understanding and practice as a consequence of representing a particular tradition. Some chaplains express their aim in relation to religion in general terms: ‘[t]o demonstrate to everyone in the university that faith and belief has an important place… in the lives of individuals and the community’ (Buddhist, post-1992). Or, more commonly, ‘[t]o provide space for all people to do their religious activities (e.g. prayer rooms for different faiths) and events for all to gather and share their views’ (Hindu, post-1992). For many respondents, the focus is upon working from the basis of their own faith tradition: ‘[t]o support Jewish students on campus’; to be ‘[t]he presence of the Catholic Church on campus’; ‘being a point of contact and support for people with an interest in, but not necessarily a member of, Buddhism’. This latter emphasis can also include the defence of a particular group through means of making their presence known and catering for their needs: e.g. ‘[b]ecause there aren’t many Quakers, it tends not to be a pastoral role, it’s more helping to raise awareness of the Quakers…[and]…to be a Quaker voice on the university panel representing belief in a largely Anglican institution’ (Quaker, traditional elite).

While also working from one’s grounding in a particular tradition, a connected task is the building of links outwards and into the university community. It might mean creating ‘an environment of intellectual openness that has encouraged Jews from across the university to re-engage with a community that they recognise to be compatible with, and relevant to, their academic pursuits’ (Jewish, traditional elite). Making positive connections is also a key component for those chaplains who signalled their primary aim as inter-faith work: ‘To promote good inter-faith understanding, promote global citizenship among students, create good understanding of religious complexity, help the university liaise with religious organisations in the city’ (Anglican, post-1992 university). Finally, on the basis that the 2015 Counter Terrorism legislation implies the need for the religious expertise of chaplains, the two chaplains who conceived safeguarding against extremism as their primary purpose have also been placed in this category. ‘To ensure that students do not get lured into activities contrary to British values’ is how one of these chaplains, a Muslim at a post-1992 university, expresses this.

Presence (12%)

Chaplains who see presence as their primary aim are essentially placing being (or ‘being there’45) before doing and activity, not as a replacement for the latter, but because the former essentially leads to the latter. ‘It is to be who I am in this context from which meaningful doing flows’ (Anglican, post-1992). Presence can have a number of descriptors: ‘Christian’; ‘spiritual’; ‘religious’; ‘intentional’; ‘supportive’; ‘pastoral’. It is connected to visibility and the constituting of a sign: ‘[t]o offer a visible presence and a reminder of matters of faith and spirituality’ (Christian, Cathedrals Group). Presence is also about availability and friendliness – things students highly prize in a chaplain as we shall see later. To the old language of loitering (with or without intent) is added a new phrase, ‘spiritual pot-holing’. Without being exclusively so, presence is commonly associated with Christian chaplains, calling forth a theological explication: to ‘provide a living presence of the love and mercy and grace of Christ in the university. This sometimes looks explicitly religious, at other [times] it does not’ (Anglican, traditional elite). Lastly, presence can be expressed through the language of ‘safe space’ and ‘sanctuary’, often referring to a physical location which both enables, and stands in proxy for, the chaplain’s ministry of presence. According to a Methodist chaplain based at a red brick university, ‘Chaplaincy is about providing a safe and welcoming space for students and staff to feel loved and valued.’

45. See Dunlop (2017) for the prevalent use of this phrase by chaplains.
**Spiritual (11%)**

In describing their aim as primarily spiritual, a number of chaplains see themselves drawing attention to a distinct, perhaps neglected, dimension of life: ‘To be there and to be a reminder to people that you are not here for material things, but you can think about life spiritually too...’ (Roman Catholic, 1960s campus). Or, in the words of a Jewish chaplain at a red brick university: ‘[t]o be a centre for spirituality within what is deemed to be a secular university’. These statements illustrate the point made above that though, for the sake of analysis, we are separating out various strands of primary aim, these aims overlap. Witnessing to and claiming space for a spiritual dimension is close to the prophetic aim of calling assumptions into question, for example (see below).

Others emphasise exploration: ‘To create space for exploring spirituality’ (Bahá’í, traditional elite), or ‘Creating spaces for students and staff to encounter the ‘Other’ and to explore their spirituality’ (Anglican, traditional elite). The aim of providing ‘spiritual support’ in connection with exploration is frequently expressed: one chaplain aims at ‘[t]oaising spiritual awareness and promoting wellbeing’ (Christian, post-1992); another seeks ‘[t]o exemplify the principles of a spiritual life in helping others’ (Hindu, traditional elite). What this group of responses has in common is that they do not mention religion. Perhaps this is because they see the term ‘spiritual’ as more inclusive and accessible, without some of the toxic ‘baggage’ that comes with the term ‘religion’, yet nonetheless distinct and meaningful within a university context.

**Mission (11%)**

Only Christian chaplains gave responses related to mission. Some use the language of witness: ‘[t]o be a witness to the concern that God has for the whole of the world, not just the religious. To be a counter-cultural presence’ (Methodist, red brick). Many speak of seeking to point to and demonstrate God’s love: ‘[t]o be a visible reminder of God’s love in all sorts of ways: through hospitality, availability and apt liturgy’ (Anglican, traditional elite). The Christian faith is also understood as a resource: ‘[h]elping the community explore the Christian faith as a source of wisdom and direction in a rapidly changing world’ (Anglican, traditional elite). In speaking of how chaplains communicate something of God the notion of ‘embodiment’ and ‘sacrament’ is employed, commonly in relation to the person of Jesus, or of the Kingdom of God that Jesus sought to inaugurate. Their responses seem to concern making the richness and resources of one’s faith tradition available to others, as in, ‘[c]reating spaces and places where students and staff can encounter something of God, directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally’ (Anglican, Cathedrals Group).

A couple of answers move beyond the notion of creating opportunity to an explicit aim of evangelisation as in this Christian Orthodox Chaplain: ‘[t]o develop a relationship with students with a view [italics added] to winning them to Jesus Christ, for them to build a personal relationship with God’ (post-1992). University staff and students are commonly uncomfortable with attempts at overt proselytisation (Guest 2015). Much, of course, depends on the method deployed. However, it is noteworthy that the tenor of responses in this category emphasise an open approach rooted in opportunity, alongside pursuing an intention grounded in an integrity of religious identity and purpose.

**Prophetic (7.6%)**

Seeking justice is an important aspect of the prophetic aim, whether expressed universally, ‘[t]o defend human rights, freedom of belief and freedom of worship’ (Anglican, post-1992), or in terms of one’s own faith community: ‘[c]onfidence to be Jewish and to address any antisemitism’ (Jewish, traditional elite). The prophetic also entails raising profound questions: ‘remind[ing] individuals and the institution that they are part of something bigger, and that not everything that has value can be measured or assessed’ (Anglican, traditional elite). This intention can be expressed in theological terms: ‘[t]o present a prophetic Christian vision and critique of society and the university’ (Christian, red brick). It also finds voice in being a ‘moral compass’: ‘to offer a different light onto the work, to say there’s another side to life. It’s not just about getting a degree and a job. [It is also about…pointing out the ethical responsibilities [attached to] degrees offered by the university’ (Anglican, post-1992).

Finally, the language of ‘common good’ finds traction: ‘[w]orking for the common good in the context of the university' (Christian, red brick).

**Building relationships (6.0%)**

One chaplain seeks to live in ‘the spaces ’in between’ and facilitat[e] conversations within this interface’ (Anglican, red brick). Others speak of ‘bridge building’ between ‘the institution and the students’ or between ‘the university and the religious group/community’. Most commonly the language is of ‘building a community’, in one instance to ‘allow students to explore themselves and grow as human beings, integrating the intellectual growth with the psychological and spiritual growth’ (Roman Catholic, red brick). Chaplains speak both of the community, envisaging their role on an institution-wide...
scale: ‘support the university community and its openness to all people of belief and non-belief’ (Anglican, red brick), or of a community where the focus is somewhat narrower: ‘to provide a supportive and inclusive community within the institution’ (Christian, 1960s campus). Additionally, though surprisingly few use this term, ‘[h]ospitality in its broadest sense’ is also a way of privileging building relationships.

The relative proportions of each category of primary aim are depicted in Figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1: Chaplains’ views on the primary aim of chaplaincy (%)

The pastoral aim, as already stated, constitutes the largest proportion. Yet, interestingly, two thirds of our sample offer an alternative primary focus. It would be wrong to assume that the pastoral task is what most chaplains believe to be their principal preoccupation. Looking beyond the pastoral, and setting aside the very small ‘other’ category, there is a reasonably equal distribution of aim across the six remaining categories. This is not unexpected, because a consistent finding of this research has been that the chaplaincy role is shaped, to an unprecedented degree among university functions, by both the character, talents and interests of chaplains, particularly the lead chaplain (if there is one) and the nature, size and distribution of any facilities, space or premises available to them. Faced with the question of primary aim, one would expect the results to be dispersed.

However, precisely because chaplains actually perform many roles, it is possible to view these results in a different way and suggest that what these seven categories of aim reveal is a repertoire of roles, distinct but also overlapping within the working lives of university chaplains.46 Even a cursory glance at the breadth and nature of this repertoire demonstrates the unique contribution chaplains make, for there is no other single role within a university that covers this ground. This is a point to which we shall return when examining how the university-based managers of chaplaincy view the contribution chaplains’ make.

46. Please see Chapter 3 where we describe in detail what chaplains actually do, as opposed to what they believe they should prioritise.
Differences by type of university

How then does university type, according to our five-fold classification, impinge upon a chaplain’s primary aim?

A pastoral primary aim is the predominant category for red brick (38.4%), 1960s campus (38.9%) and post-1992 universities (37.5%). In each of these three types, the second most popular primary aim is religious, demonstrating a remarkable similarity of result. The traditional elite universities follow the same basic pattern, although in these the pastoral and religious aims share equal prominence (at 23.8%).

The notable anomaly are the Cathedrals Group universities where the aim of mission, at 29.4% runs at a rate almost three times greater than its closest comparator (11.1% at 60s campuses). It is also distinguished by the level of commitment to presence (23.5%), meaning that the pastoral aim, most or equally popular in other types of university, here comes only third (20.6%).

Differences by religion of chaplain

Only Christian chaplains have representation in all of our categories of aim, with other religion and belief traditions present within a smaller set. Across all groups, however, either the pastoral (Christian, Muslim, Sikh and other) or religious aim (Buddhist, Hindu and Jewish) is the most popular choice. With the exception of Christians, pastoral and religious comprise both the first or second choice with a combined total proportion of primary aim between 63.7% (Buddhists) and 94.1% (Muslims). Only Hindu and Christian chaplains see presence as a primary aim, while Buddhist chaplains have an above average commitment to a prophetic aim (18.2% compared to an overall average of 7.6%).

Christian and non-Christian traditions demonstrate a very different choice of primary aim, as Figures 2.3 and 2.4 show.

---

47. These differences are statistically significant. For Cathedrals Group versus red bricks, p = <0.01; for Cathedrals Group versus traditional elites, p = <0.05.

48. This comparison is of indicative value only, as the proportion of Buddhist chaplains is too small to calculate a meaningful p value.

49. Combining the non-Christian groups gives statistical weight to enable a robust analysis. p = < 0.001.
**Figure 2.3:** Views of the primary aim of chaplaincy among non-Christian chaplains

**Figure 2.4:** Views of the primary aim of chaplaincy among Christian chaplains
In addition to only Christian chaplains expressing their aim as mission, significant differences emerge in the proportions opting for aims that are religious (39.9% vs 11.7%) or concern presence (1.2% vs 14.8%).

**Christian chaplains’ aims**

If we consider only Christian chaplains, the proportion of chaplains selecting a religious aim now falls noticeably in every university type except the traditional elites. For example, in red brick universities it reduces from 38.4% to 9.3%. For traditional elite universities, though, the religious aim falls only slightly: 20.3% compared to its previous level of 23.8%. Why do traditional elites behave differently? This may well be a consequence of the central role played by the large and ancient chapels traditionally associated with this type of university: traditional elite Christian chaplains consider it legitimate for them to have a religious aim because of the close connection between the role of being a chaplain and the job of maintaining chapel worship (as in the Dean of Chapel role common at Oxford and Cambridge).

Whether chaplains use Christian language to express their primary aim was then investigated, to see how this varies by university type.

Expressing one’s aim in Christian language is most likely to occur in Cathedral Group universities (46.7%), more than double the likelihood of doing so in red brick Institutions (22.2%). Interestingly, however, even in Cathedrals Group universities, where the conditions appear to be most favourable to enabling chaplains to use explicitly Christian terms, 53.3%, a narrow majority, did not do so.

**Differences by pay and hours worked**

It is not hours worked that is the determinate factor in the distribution of primary aim, but rather whether a chaplain is paid or not. Comparing those who work the same 5-30 hours a week but are either paid (N=72) or unpaid (N=45), the differences between aims are clear. 51

---

50. Fisher’s Exact Test p = <0.05.

51. P = 0.005. The 5-30 hours category was chosen because of the large samples (N) in both the paid and volunteer categories, thereby allowing meaningful direct comparison.

---

**Figure 2.5**: Christian chaplains’ use of language in describing their primary aim
Amongst volunteers, there is a higher concentration on the pastoral aim (53.3% vs 22.2%) and a reduction in presence as a primary goal (4.4% vs 15.3%). Volunteers are also more likely to see a prophetic aim as their primary choice (13.3% vs 5.6%), suggesting volunteers feel freer to pose critical or prophetic challenges.

Presence, as a primary aim, might be thought the privilege of those who have time to engage in ‘being-there’. Thus the reason far fewer non-Christian chaplains opt for this aim (1.2% vs 14.8%) could be because, on average, they spend less time than their Christian counterparts in chaplaincy work. However, our comparison above suggests this is false since both groups work similar hours, yet there was a marked difference between them. Further elucidation is found by considering just Christian chaplains, where presence is a more common choice. Here also time does not seem to be the issue since the proportion expressing a primary aim of presence is virtually identical between those who work 30+ hours a week (17.2%) and those who regularly work less than 5 hours (17.7%). Presence, we conclude, is more about mind-set than time. Those working few hours can very well share the same conception of the importance of presence as their full-time counterparts. The difference in likelihood of aiming at presence between non-Christian and Christian chaplains, then, is likely to be grounded in different conceptual (theological) understandings of chaplaincy.

Interpreting chaplains’ comments on their primary aim

Chaplains are appointed on the basis of a wide range of criteria, but distinctively because they subscribe to a particular religion or belief tradition. This required identity, rooted in public belief, marks them out amongst others who work in a university environment. This is not a distinction of vocation or values-oriented professionalism – these ideas are often associated with the institutional life of universities and the working lives of those who work in them (Higton 2012). But chaplains are distinctive in embodying a set of beliefs and values imported into universities by virtue of their role as representatives of external bodies; moreover, this dual affiliation is essential to their role as chaplains. One might argue that chaplains should be free to express their intended primary aim, if they choose to do so, in language which resonates with this public identity. Yet, when we asked 367 chaplains to do this, only Christian chaplains elected to do so. Not a single chaplain from another tradition used religious language to describe their primary aim beyond stating the name of their tradition. Even mentions of ‘God’ were exclusively made by Christians. Before we reflect on possible reasons for this, we should note that the majority of Christians (70.3%) also prefer what we might term generic, ‘secular’ language to describe their role.

52. This distinction also holds for the whole data sample with volunteers at 11.9% versus paid chaplains at 4.3% (p < 0.05).

Figure 2.6: Chaplains’ views about their primary aim by status as paid or voluntary (5-30 hours per week)
It seems, therefore, that there is a pressure, or a learned expectation, acting on chaplains which means theological or belief language is not their instinctive first port of call. This pressure seems to be in play even when chaplains are thinking in the realm of aim, of intention, rather than offering a description of concrete practice where more widely comprehensible language might be expected. Christians use theological expressions sparingly, non-Christians not at all. There is also a parallel effect in the range of primary aim chosen by chaplains: across our seven key categories only Christians are represented in every single one. Non-Christian chaplains focus on just two main aims: religious and pastoral. Does this reflect accommodation to what they understand the university to expect of them? We suggest that both the primary aim, and the way in which it is expressed, are being conformed to the language and expectation of the institution for whom they work. This might explain why Cathedrals Group chaplains, acting in a context in which the language of theology still has public currency and institutional backing, demonstrate the greatest freedom to both use theological terminology and, for example, see their primary aim as mission. This conclusion will be tested in the next section.

Students' views on chaplaincy's contribution to university life

Students from each of our case study universities who had at least some experience of using the chaplaincy service were invited to fill in a questionnaire that sought to discern their understanding of chaplaincy. While not precisely the same question as that of the primary aim, which enquired after intention, we asked a strongly correlated one: ‘In your own words, and based on your own experience, what contribution do chaplains make to university life?’ Here, then, students are reporting on what has actually been experienced. The same categories used above to analyse chaplains’ primary aim fit well, and enable us to make a direct comparison between what chaplains hope to offer and what students experience as having been offered. On the basis of the 114 students who answered that question, responses can be grouped as in Figure 2.7.

![Figure 2.7](image_url)  
*Figure 2.7 The chaplain’s primary role, as described by chaplains and students (%)*
This shows a significant, although imperfect, degree of alignment. In our case study universities at least, students seem to be experiencing, in many cases, what chaplains seek to offer. However, two exceptions exist in respect of building relationships and mission. Students more readily use the language of relationships and community as the main focus of chaplaincy’s contribution. Is that a generational perspective?\(^{53}\)

The more striking difference occurs within the category of mission. In speaking of chaplaincy’s contribution, students almost never use theological language; there is only one instance of the use of ‘God’. In the ‘mission’ category there is no theological phraseology (c.f. the 93% of chaplain responses within this category employing such language). Instead, the very few student responses that fall within the category of mission speak rather of opportunities to find out about religion: ‘[chaplains] make it easier for students of faith, or even those interested in finding out more, to be able to have the opportunity to do so (Christian, home student 1960s campus).’\(^{54}\)

Another speaks of university as a time of questioning: ‘[a] lot of people question or try to establish their beliefs while at university, and having someone knowledgeable to speak with about spiritual and religious things is so important (Christian, home student, traditional elite).’\(^{54}\)

Case study interviews: How do chaplains and managers conceive of the chaplain’s role?

Turning to findings from face-to-face interviews in our five case study universities shows how a qualitative approach can complement this picture. The question of the role of chaplaincy\(^{55}\) was asked of chaplains themselves, university managers, local religious organisations responsible for chaplaincy, and national religious figures, revealing many complementary perspectives. Interviewees from each constituency with an interest in university chaplaincy all recognise that a chaplain’s role in contemporary Britain is far from clear-cut or straightforward.

One striking, perhaps unsurprising, pattern across stakeholders in university chaplaincy, is the sense that being a chaplain often means occupying a place on the fringes.

\[Y\]ou sort of read [about a] sort of golden era where the chaplain led morning prayer and everybody turned up and the chaplain was fully involved in, you know... all areas of the university and I read that and think, oh that sounds nice doesn’t it... and then I remind myself that we’re in the 21\text{st} century and being on the fringes and feeling on the fringes, is actually par for the course in chaplaincy (Anglican chaplain, red brick)

The red brick Jewish chaplain speaks of how no one understands the term ‘chaplain’ any longer.

The thing about ‘chaplain’ is nobody really knows what it means...It’s an unhelpful term in that its widest meaning covers everything we do, that’s fine, but we have difficulty with those who come from a non-religious background, non-religious culture, who have no idea what religion is let alone Christianity or chapel and we find it very difficult to explain what a chaplain is...

Awareness is shared that these difficulties stem, in part, from the shifting place of religion in society and in universities.

I know religious things are dying a slow death here... It’s a struggle. I think that goes beyond the university. I think it’s a society wide thing. So, do we just accept that and work with what we have? Does chaplaincy just accept that it works with who it has or is it supposed to be drawing more people in? I don’t know how to do that, because I think it’s difficult to work against the current societal trends. (Professor of Social Studies, post-1992)

A local religious leader concurs, but significantly sees this factor as enhancing the position chaplains occupy. In a context where general levels of religious literacy do not match the requirement for productive conversation, chaplains have a vital role to play.

The paradox is that society becomes steadily more secular, there’s no reversal in that, but... we talk more about faith than we used to and the combo is very hard because the process of secularisation is diminishing our vocabulary, metaphor, narrative, sensitivities to the thing we need to talk about. That’s why the conversation is ill-informed and ill-mannered. (local Anglican leader, red brick)

\(^{53}\) See for example the work done on the characteristics of so-called Generation Y by Savage et al. (2011). See also Guest et al. (2013: 196).

\(^{54}\) Guest et al. report that students feel uncomfortable doing or experiencing evangelism (2013: 153). See also, Guest (2015: 358-9).

\(^{55}\) ‘What makes chaplaincy effective? What does good chaplaincy or faith advisor work look like? What do you think the role of chaplaincy should be within the university?’ In the analysis that follows we separate out role and the qualities of good chaplaincy or faith advisor work for the sake of clarity.
The contemporary task of university chaplaincy is complex. How do chaplains and managers we interviewed understand the role? Each of the seven categories of aim are utilised by chaplains when describing their role. Managers, on the other hand, concentrate most on the religious and pastoral roles, mirroring what we found when considering non-Christian chaplains (and a majority of Christian chaplains).

This observation lends support to the hypothesis that many chaplains both express and understand their purpose in ways influenced by the university managers who oversee chaplaincy work. We begin this examination of role with the prominent categories of pastoral and religious.

Chaplaincy’s pastoral role

Our telephone survey of chaplains revealed the pastoral as the single largest category of primary aim. University managers also commonly see this as a central role of chaplains.

[Chaplaincy] makes [a] significant difference to… individual students’ experience and lives - particularly students who may be vulnerable, or looking for some support. (Deputy Director of Student Services, post-1992)

Managers responsible for the provision of student services seem to readily appreciate and understand the complementary and distinctive provision offered by chaplaincy.

What [chaplains] provide is probably in essence potentially more important than what we provide in terms of ongoing support because we will provide a professionalised, one off session, assessment mental health plan. I think chaplaincy provides something completely outside that medical model…[What]a lot of students need who are unwell is a network of support, a friendly community of people who are just there, non-judgemental and supportive, and I think chaplaincy does try to do that here quite well…[chaplaincy offers] something which is not time-limited, something that is not focussed on their ill-health, but actually is normalising and supportive and creates a connection for people who might be struggling. (Head of Welfare, red brick)

Because of this distinctive quality of support, the same manager is unsure that the term ‘faith advisor’, now popular in some institutions, captures what is on offer.

And ‘faith advisor’ doesn’t really capture it, does it? It isn’t just about faith advice, so… I think it should be something like Pastoral Care Centre… ‘pastoral care’ still has a religious theme to it, but it’s more broad. (Head of Welfare, red brick)

This last observation is worth underlining. The term ‘pastoral’ still carries overtones of its religious origins, and witnesses to the way in which the chaplaincy task cannot be reduced without remainder to other sources of professional support. The Cathedrals Group Vice-Chancellor agrees:

I don’t think we can ever remove the spiritual dimension [from human issues] and that is sometimes grief which is part of being human and you need to cater for that, you need to cater for a staff member who’s had bad news about their health…[T]hose are not clinical problems…[T]he chaplaincy is a…place of healing of a much deeper kind and very often those under stress get their best benefits by being valued as individuals…[through] the chaplaincy.

What of the chaplains themselves? In the following quotation, the distinctive contribution of chaplains is expressed in terms of a holistic approach.

I think [chaplaincy]…should support students of… any kind of background, so it should have that student support kind of role…the kind of whole person approach and to recognise that for some people…there will be other dimensions too that need looking after so, you know…not just emotional and psychological but also spiritual or transcendental… aspects of life. (Assistant Roman Catholic chaplain, post-1992)

Chaplains place emphasis on keeping the pastoral task free from any personal agenda or ulterior interest.

I’m not here to get more people to the Anglican church and I think that is about chaplaincy being truly seen to be about the needs…of the students, and…supporting them in terms of their wellbeing, their mental health and all the rest…rather than it being about promoting particular brands. (Anglican lead chaplain, post-1992)

Another chaplain prioritised being of service.

[C]haplaincy is service, in my opinion. You are earmarked from the organisation to serve the organisation. So when you are a service you don’t then get to dictate what you do a lot of the time because it’s responsive… We’re not here to make people believe in Jesus more…that’s not my goal, if people want to talk to me about my own faith or about Jesus or about
faith then I will happily talk to people, but that’s not the secret background agenda. (Free Church chaplain, Cathedrals Group)

Freedom from any form of agenda, and so the independence of chaplaincy from any project of ideological persuasion, is also affirmed by the Cathedrals Group Vice Chancellor, representing CUAC: 56

[The chaplain]’s a great listener and someone to talk to and…makes absolutely no distinction between… whether there’s someone who comes to the chaplaincy or somebody who participates. [The chaplain] treats everybody equally… I know people who have suffered bereavement who were very opposed to chaplaincy and following [the chaplains’] intervention, they couldn’t speak more highly… because [the chaplain] was very supportive just in a neutral way.

Another national figure endorses the view that one should do whatever one can to help the person in front of you.

[Maybe the issue isn’t spiritual, it’s discerning what their issue is. They’re coming to you with one thing, so maybe their issue is actually psychological, and you’ve got to pass them on to student welfare, counselling… it’s just discerning what their issue is. If there’s a way you can help them spiritually then that’s good… [The dharma, the right thing to do for a Hindu priest, is to help the person in front of them [get] from where they are to somewhere better. (National Hindu representative)

There is broad appreciation and recognition of the proficiency chaplains bring to the pastoral task; it complements and extends that on offer from other university support services. The emphasis on making the best interest of the person before one paramount, should reassure those who harbour the often unexamined suspicion that the religious identity of chaplains means that their offer of help is some form of Trojan horse.

Chaplaincy’s religious role

University managers, as we have seen, are often aware of the complexity of religious identity and religious needs in a context that is a confusing admixture of the Christian, the secular and the multi-religious (Weller 2008). They thus readily understand and value the religious role of chaplains. In this first example, it is the religious expertise of chaplains that is prized.

[W]e turn to [chaplains] for advice and guidance about specific things that crop up during the year. That might be how we should best deal with Ramadan during exams, for example, and we’ll liaise with the Muslim chaplain and talk about that. In some cases, we’ve had anti-Semitism and unfortunate things like that, we might talk to [the Jewish Chaplain] about…’what does it feel like on the ground for Jewish students from your perspective?’ (Director of Student Experience, red brick)

Another manager concerned with student wellbeing concurs.

I think [chaplaincy]’s also effective in terms of its… core mission, of supporting individual students’ faith needs, and catering for those, and connecting them with other people of similar faith perhaps, or places of worship, or… faith leaders from… other faiths as they need. (Deputy Director of Student Services, post-1992)

What did chaplains say about the religious role? When it was mentioned, chaplains were often conscious of their part in providing but one component of a wider array of opportunities for faith and belief exploration. The traditional elite Buddhist chaplain puts the matter well.

[One role] is to provide… the context for people who want to explore faiths in whatever way… to do that within the university kind of context, so that’s things like, you know, our [meditation] group but also the… worship that happens in the chapels and other societies, and discussion groups and so on.

Most of the national religious figures interviewed were clear that a primary, though certainly not an exclusive role of chaplains, was to work with those of the tradition they represented. The National Roman Catholic Co-ordinator was careful to nuance her view of the matter.

[The expectation of Catholic university chaplains of themselves and of their sending bodies will be that they have a particular responsibility to Catholic students and for many that ministry will be centred around the celebration of the Sunday Eucharist, certainly not all but for many it will be centred on Sunday. (National Roman Catholic Co-ordinator)
Her view, however, is that this particular religious responsibility must be seen within the context of a holistic vision of how chaplaincy can contribute to the broader learning culture that defines what a university can be.

Others put the religious role first, but envisaged a chaplain working outwards from their tradition into the rest of the university.

I think there are three contributions. The overt faith contribution, so a Buddhist chaplain being there to support other Buddhists, pastorally but also in the celebration of festivals and so on and so forth. A second one, much more on a general basis, where the provision is for anybody, so meditation classes open to any, and I know from my own experience, attended by people of all sorts of faiths and no faith, who are looking to benefit from the meditation in some way or another. And then thirdly, a contribution to academia. (National Buddhist representative)

The question of how one works from a particular religious identity - holding this with integrity - into a diverse university context of belief is addressed by one local religious leader from an Anglican perspective (with the added complication of the inherited expectations of being an Established Church for all). In essence, the answer is that one faith tradition might seek to keep the door open for others in a secularising environment.

I think probably the most effective thing is just being there, a kind of ministry of presence, being at events, taking part in events and being there, especially in times of need, for personal need, spiritual need. (Roman Catholic chaplain, traditional elite)

We may conclude that the religious role is fully endorsed by each of our four constituencies of interviewees; a clear consensus exits.

Chaplaincy’s role as presence

Our telephone survey revealed that chaplains see presence as a way of privileging ‘being’ over ‘doing’. Face-to-face interviews suggest that presence, ‘being there’, is understood as a precursor to building good relationships. In both cases presence is understood in a way that seems to challenge the performance-driven contemporary university. For this Cathedrals Group Vice-Chancellor, speaking in a Christian theological register, the role of chaplains is about,

[M]eeting people where people…meet, meeting the students where they are and not building religious structures on the campus…[O]ur Lord went to the synagogue but he went to the marketplace…It is being where students are, spotting the need and caring.

Chaplains readily, almost instinctively, adopt the language of presence, especially Christian chaplains.

Chaplaincy’s role of building relationships

This university manager appreciates that chaplains are able to build relationships of a particular quality; in this instance rooted in love.

Chaplaincy’s role of building relationships

This university manager appreciates that chaplains are able to build relationships of a particular quality; in this instance rooted in love.

[The chaplain]…is promoting that people should just love each other and just take care of each other and strive for change. [S]ome people don’t want to hear the religious side…. Because you can’t go out there and try and evangelise people. People will just think you’re crazy or you just turn them off. So, I think from your actions and the things that you’re doing, you might lead people to be much more accepting of [chaplaincy]. (Professor of Social Studies, post-1992)
This kind of consideration leads to the conviction, again from a university management perspective, that chaplaincy teams should themselves model the very quality of relationship they seek to promote.

I suppose the current situation with there being this tension between the chaplaincy team about this new direction of travel and the management, means that it’s more of a headache than it has been in previous years...[But] if we can’t get a group of those people to work with each other, that’s a problem. (Director of Student Experience, red brick)

As one might expect, this view is endorsed by chaplains.

My feeling is that a good chaplaincy would be a place where lots of people can gather, and be together and get on with each other, support each other, and I think it’s a place where people from different cultures and different faiths can be alongside each other and learn from each other. (Roman Catholic chaplain, 1960s campus)

Prioritising relationships can also mean calling into question what are assumed professional boundaries if what one is doing is actually best understood as a giving of oneself.

Some of the best chaplaincy work I’ve done is play football with the staff on the Tuesdays and the Fridays, you get to know people, you’re in people’s lives, they know you’re a chaplain...[S]ome chaplains make the distinction between, ‘You are my student, you are not my friend’. They wouldn’t say it that bluntly but, ‘I have a list of students that I support’, that’s the language some chaplains use. ... For me, that’s not the most effective way of doing it because what I’m choosing to do is live my life here, give it my best, and open myself up to vulnerable people. (Free Church chaplain, Cathedrals Group)

Chaplaincy’s prophetic role

Significant differences emerge from the general agreement observed between the different constituencies interviewed at our case study universities, however, when we consider the prophetic role of chaplaincy, which, though endorsed by some chaplains, is not mentioned by any university manager. Chaplains alone voice this particular role.

One chaplain offers a helpful definition of the territory by speaking of,

...that sort of prophetic role, that sense that the chaplain is to an extent accepted into the inner courts of the university but actually has the power to say things that an employee of the university, the manager of the university couldn’t say and also holds that space for students, a space where students can say things that they wouldn’t be able to say to their tutors or to people more embedded within the university structure and chaplains are available to do that. (Anglican chaplain, red brick)

This role can also be expounded as one of generally promoting questions, as being a force of disturbance. Chaplaincy should create,

...an opportunity for discussion, for debate, for dialogue between different...areas of thought and...[a] healthy kind of discussion which I think is what...university’s all about... creating those spaces where people can have those encounters with other people and other traditions and other histories. (Assistant Roman Catholic Chaplain, post-1992)

Chaplaincy’s missional role

What the prophetic and missional role have in common is a challenging of the status quo, a disturbing of assumptions. If chaplaincy is confined to a pastoral and religious role it could be accused of being a modern day ‘opiate for the people’ by enabling people to reconcile themselves with a current state of affairs which is less than it might be. Chaplaincy is rendered safe and useable, but its distinctive contribution to university life is blunted.

In our telephone interviews, only Christian chaplains employed the language of mission, but here, from our post-1992 university case study, is a Sikh voice articulating just this perspective.

I think [chaplaincy] recognises that there’s more to life than academia or material things and it’s about the wellbeing of...the soul effectively ...and a lot of people aren’t even aware that’s what we’re here for. They think it’s all about cars and houses and money and, and status and fame and stuff like that...[W]e talk about work life balance...but there’s also spiritual...life balance...which I think is probably lacking...in a lot of the material world that we see...[T]hrough the chaplaincy... there’s...a discussion and dialogue there and there’s an opening of eyes to, you know, possibilities.

57. This, of course, was one of Karl Marx’s fundamental criticisms of religion: reconciliation with evil. See Kee (1990: 30-35).
Only one of the university managers we interviewed recognised that mission might form part of a chaplains’ role repertoire. Coming from the same institution as the Sikh chaplain above, the place of action over words is emphasised.

You wouldn’t be going to evangelise people to say, you know, God is light and there is no other way but through the Son and this sort of thing, but through your actions, you are able to show love … which to me, is a spiritual dimension. (Academic Manager, post-1992)

The distinction between proselytisation and mission is made clear by this lead chaplain.

Transparent to Christ. That’s what I try to be. I try to be loving, with the love of Jesus Christ. That means taking people utterly seriously, as they are. In their intellectual interests, like conversations, in their problems, whatever these are, in their desire to discover their faith. If someone comes in here and says, ‘I’m a Muslim … I’m losing my faith’, I want to be the person who helps them to talk that through … I don’t want to convert them, but I want to be the person who would help them with that. (lead Christian chaplain, traditional elite)

Another chaplain makes a similar point.

[I]f somebody is opening up questions of…life and meaning [it is appropriate] to be able to gently explore God if that is something that is being welcomed. It’s not about proselytising. I think there’s a really clear boundary around this. But there is something about not being so embarrassed and apologetic in the wrong sense for…Christian faith…But it’s not the first thing you say when you sit down with someone. (Anglican chaplain, red brick)

The place of mission is validated by both local religious leaders and national figures engaged with university chaplaincy. They too place the stress on mission as creating opportunity for engagement with other ways of seeing things.

Another sign of a thriving chaplaincy is that questions of faith hover in the air, so it’s a bit of keeping the rumour of God alive kind of stuff, but it’s also saying… the spiritual journey is an important component of the development of human beings as whole people and the university as an institution devoted to the diminishing of ignorance and the development of human flourishing. (Anglican local leader, 1960s campus)

The Church of England National HE Policy Adviser has this to say:

I’m going to borrow some words, derived from Irenaeus, and put into the 1928 Bampton Lectures by Kenneth Kirk, where I think he described the task of the church as offering people…the vision of God and calling them to pursue that vision. I think glossing that for the 21st century…part of the chaplain’s role and the chaplaincy’s role is to offer people a vision of God. To bring into their view that which in our theology is already present and active. And to do that in terms which are intelligible, credible and attractive. Now, one of the reasons I like Kirk’s formulation of it, is because it’s about an offering. It doesn’t have within it the implication of compulsion, psychological or otherwise. It therefore embodies the notion that it’s a gift and it’s a gift freely offered which the recipients may choose to take or not.

Chaplaincy’s spiritual role

To conclude this examination of how the role of chaplains is understood by different groups with an investment in university chaplaincy, curiously university managers did not employ the spiritual category when asked about the role of chaplains. This is counterintuitive because one might have imagined that this was a ready and available term that would be widely commended as comprehensible and relevant. Rather, this mode of expression is left to chaplains and national figures. For the traditional elite Pagan chaplain, ‘providing an atmosphere, in which a spiritual outlook is encouraged without being prescriptive, is really quite precious I think.’

The national humanist spokesperson concurs:

[People think chaplaincy is a religious service. And I think that is an important part of it. For some people religion is very important to them and they should be able to get that religious care that they’re looking for… But it also needs to be understood that [chaplaincy]’s a pastoral and spiritual service as well.}

58. See Stephen Hunt (2013) who considers whether chaplaincy is embracing the language of wellbeing.
What do students think makes a good chaplain?

There appears to be broad consensus between students and chaplains about the range of the chaplaincy task. We now ask, beginning with students, about the kind of characteristics a good chaplain should demonstrate. In the survey of students at the case study universities we asked, ‘What would you say makes a good chaplain?’ Their answers can be analysed in terms of five desirable personal traits and skills (together with an ‘other’ category).

How are these characteristics and skills being understood? As with chaplains, where students indicated more than one attribute, the first one mentioned is given most weight in assigning a category. As Figure 2.8 reveals, the stand out answer is that a good chaplain should be approachable.

**Approachable (40.5%)**

Although there are many entries in this category, they are easily described due to their similarity. The key descriptors here are: ‘approachable’; ‘friendly’; ‘warm’; ‘visible’; ‘a presence’; ‘available’. Thus good examples of a response endorsing this facility are: ‘[a] friendly approachable person who has presence outside of places of worship’ (Christian, home student, traditional elite); ‘friendly, warm hearted, approachable’ (Jewish, EU student, traditional elite).

**Open and non-judgemental (16.5%)**

Openness is about ‘[c]learly being open to the perspectives of others’ (Christian, home student, traditional elite) and in particular ‘not biased, welcoming to all peoples of all faiths, ages, genders etc.’ (Muslim, home student, post-1992) This is repeatedly linked to ‘[s]omeone that’s understanding and EXTREMELY non-judgemental’ (Christian, international student, 1960s campus). Why? Because chaplains need to understand:

[T]hat university time is a time of formation of beliefs and so being non-judgemental when students come with questions or ideas, as the good chaplain understands these ideas are not necessarily representative of the beliefs a student does or will hold but rather they are ideas on the student’s mind that they want to explore to help them develop their spirituality. (Christian, international student, traditional elite)

**Integrity of faith (10.7%)**

**Good listener (10.7%)**

**Compassionate (14.9%)**

**Other (6.6%)**

---

59. See Chapter 6 for a description of how the survey was administered to students.
Integrity of faith (14.9%):

While student responses to the question of the contribution of chaplaincy lacked theological language, student comments on the need for chaplains to have ‘integrity of faith’ are peppered with such expressions. Chaplains ‘must also have faith. It is not enough to be the most personable, brilliant and open-minded chaplain if you do not carry faith, hope, an incredible love towards God and all people within you, you will not be effective’ (Christian, home student, traditional elite). They must be a person, ‘who is not afraid to be honest and speak boldly about the Gospel, but who will do so with sensitivity’ (Christian, home student, Cathedrals Group). They should, ‘offer…preaching of the Gospel (‘God is with us!’ as content)’ (Christian, international student, traditional elite). ‘Christlikeness’ is required. In summary, chaplains should be ‘able to provide services to students of any faith or lack thereof while staying true to their usually specific religious beliefs.’(Christian, home student, traditional elite). Although Christian students comprised the majority of students’ surveyed (at 75.8%), it is worth noting that every response in this category was made by a student identifying as Christian. This repeats the observation made about chaplains: only the Christians seem prepared to use explicit language of faith and belief when answering such questions.

A good listener (10.7%):

This is a chaplain with ‘a listening ear and a quiet mouth, so someone who has not always got the answer’ (Christian, home student Cathedrals Group). Someone who ‘[u]nderstands students; cares about people; [is a] good listener’ (Other religion, home student, red brick).

Compassionate and understanding (10.7%)

‘A good chaplain…understands to some degree the struggles and nature of student life in the modern day’ (Christian, home student, red brick). They should demonstrate ‘compassion and attentiveness’, ‘empathy’, ‘love, wisdom and tenderness’, ‘understanding different faiths [and] being open to all’ (Muslim, home student, 1960s campus). Nevertheless, a good chaplain should also retain their critical edge: ‘Being kind, compassionate and open to listening. It can also mean telling people things they don’t want to hear’ (Christian, home student, traditional elite).

Case study interviews: Characteristics of ‘good chaplaincy work’

Asked what makes a good chaplain, students, as we saw, voted emphatically for approachableness with 40.5% of responses falling within this classification. While most of our student respondents were Christians, this emphasis is echoed in Siddiqi’s (2007) report about Muslims in UK universities. This report covers the issue of chaplaincy, and cites ‘being approachable’ among the top four qualities cited by Muslim students asked about what should characterise Muslim chaplains/advisors.60 So there is evidence to suggest pastoral skills are valued among students across religious traditions. When we asked chaplains, university managers, local religious leaders and national sponsors, ‘What does good chaplaincy or faith advisor work look like?’ the greatest concentration of answers also fell within this same domain. In describing the results of our interviews here, we use the headings created to analyse student responses to the same question. Following that, we introduce some additional observations of those we interviewed.61

Approachable

To be approachable, a chaplain needs to be visible, to be seen and known. ‘I suppose availability and being known and being seen around for me would be the most important thing for a chaplain’ (Anglican chaplain, red brick). Ensuring visibility can mean finding a way of escaping the confines of one’s office, even deploying the use of an animal friend.

I mean I am an extrovert, but it’s funny how it’s easy to just stay in your office and actually not force yourself to go out and walk around. When I’ve got the dog, I have to...take [her] out and go for a walk. I do walk and talk….students can come and say, ‘Can I walk your dog with you?’ (Anglican chaplain, 1960s campus)

This same chaplain sees working at being a recognisable figure, at being known and trusted, as a way to overcome some of the de-centring effects of ‘secularisation’ that have impacted on the status of religious figures.

I think what I’m striving for is to be an acceptable face in every area of [university] life. And I think that’s what an effective chaplaincy is, where the chaplain

60. The other three qualities listed are a strong knowledge of Islam, an understanding of the challenges faces young people living in England, and the skills to work with non-Muslims ‘in order to negotiate and work successfully with the university.’ (Siddiqi 2007: 97)

61. The category of ‘Good Listener’ is not used below because this characteristic was not explicitly mentioned by our interviewees. It remains implicitly affirmed, however, in the analysis that follows.
is back where we used to be really… I don’t know when it happened, was it in the seventies, I don’t know, eighties when the… face of the church slightly got lost somewhere along the way. We’re tolerated in so many places now, rather than actually welcomed. What I’m finding here is that I am… beginning to feel that there is a genuine welcome for what we do, and it’s appreciated. It was about dispelling some of the myths I think, and not being judgemental. And just being welcoming and not foisting my faith on people. But allowing people to respect me for what I do believe and to bring that to work. (Anglican chaplain, 1960s campus)

A crucial component of approachability is having time for people.

I think it’s… that our main job role is to be available to people. I think people are often surprised that… actually yes, we do have time, this is our job and I think sometimes students often laugh, ‘Surely it can’t be your job to sit down and have a cup of tea with me’, and I’m like, ‘Well, it actually kind of is’. (Methodist chaplain, Cathedrals Group)

Perhaps it is not just a matter of having time, but of having time now, at this moment of need. In this way, what chaplains offer can complement and be distinguished from the constrained way student support services often have to operate.

I asked… our wonderful administrator, what she thought the answer was [laughter] and she’s absolutely direct; it’s availability and availability now because there are very, very few people in the university who are available now. So, availability [to] all staff and students… what most of them want is time and simply a sympathetic ear and there are not many in the university who can do that. (local Anglican leader, red brick)

The available humanity of chaplains is also appreciated by those in managerial positions.

[From my personal experience of talking to colleagues… being able to just go and see a chaplain was something that was absolutely key in helping them deal with what they were trying to deal with at the time. That one to one, sometimes intensive, relationship I know has been very important… I would say… being able to promote Chaplaincy and that idea of being very open, of being very available, of being very inclusive, and definitively… being multi-faith… they’re all things that are going to help the continuing success of the chaplaincy. (Head of Biology, red brick)

Compassionate and understanding

Availability, then, is not just a physical question of time and space. It is also an emotional one, especially for those who find themselves on the outside of friendship groups.

Chaplaincy is a lot of the time working with vulnerable people, it doesn’t often attract the stable, the collected, because they have groups of friends that they hang out with. So you’re living your life with these people and if you have to draw the line between friendship and chaplaincy that may be missing the point. That they can just be your friends for three years and then just disappear, I think that’s okay. (Free Church chaplain, Cathedrals Group)

Those who hold official positions in their Student Union are particularly appreciative of the friendly, human consideration of chaplains. This observation held in all of our case study universities. Here is a typical expression of this sentiment.

Chaplaincy is effective because of,

The personal touch, definitely… I think [of the chaplain] as an individual and the fact that when [the chaplain] offers support, it’s not support of some random person or some student; it’s [the chaplain’s] own personal, ‘I will create an hour for you in my diary, and we can chat about whatever you want,’ is very effective… It’s definitely the fact that if you create an appointment, it’s [the chaplain] that you see and not anyone else. (Student Union President, traditional elite)

Open and non-judgemental

Students prize an open and non-judgemental attitude in chaplains. University managers use slightly different language, but uphold the same sentiment. What would good chaplaincy work look like?

[A service] that is approachable, accessible in every sense of the word and free for all, and I don’t mean free as in non-payment, I mean free as in anybody could go and anybody could talk to any chaplain, regardless of their faith, which is what we’re trying to achieve at the moment. (Disability Support Manager, 1960s campus)

Openness is desirable in chaplaincy, but for some managers there appears to be a tension between the ‘here for all’ message and an underlying belief that chaplaincy is a niche concern.
I think it’s ensuring that people of faith who require access to chaplaincy, have it at the right time. It’s part of the broader range of services that we offer is what I’d say, and making sure it’s accessible and included but it’s also not seen as something that people have to do…It’s making sure it’s accessible and visible but not in a way that makes people feel uncomfortable. (Academic Registrar, 1960s campus)

As one local religious leader responsible for chaplaincy recognises, genuine openness to all faiths and beliefs requires not only a team of various chaplains, but also an inherent degree of flexibility in each chaplain.

You sit in a room as we do as [representatives of local religious groups] every six months, and [see] the Jewish chaplain and a Muslim chaplain, and a Catholic chaplain and the Anglican chaplains, and the Buddhists and the whole range, I think there are eighteen separate groups altogether, is an amazing thing to behold. [But] [t]hat does influence what the chaplains need to be because no longer can we afford to have a chaplain that’s Methodist or Anglican or so on. When they’re on site, they need to be sympathetic to everybody whatever their own traditions. Clearly there’s a slight struggle between carrying their own rules and responsibilities but also being open to people. (local Methodist leader, red brick)

Integrity of faith

This last quotation raises the question of the personal integrity of faith of a chaplain, which students clearly find desirable. This is not a quality explicitly recognised by any university manager we interviewed, suggesting, perhaps, that managers tend to see chaplains from the ‘outside’ as those who can deliver a particular kind of service, rather than from the ‘inside’ as people who wrestle with questions of motivation and identity.

The Church of England HE Policy Adviser helps unfold this question of integrity.

What makes chaplaincy effective is firstly the integrity of the chaplain as a person of genuine faith, who loves and understands the institution which they serve. And I deliberately phrase it that way because ineffective chaplains and ineffective chaplaincy…is so concerned to be part of the institution that they forget that they are there as what [Archbishop] Ramsey used to call, ‘a representative Christian person’, that they have a representative role, they embody the faith community which they come from…people become so embedded in the institution itself, they cease to have any religious function whatsoever…. [w]hich I think is disavowing what you are existentially and ontologically.

Chaplains recognise just this requirement for existential authenticity, as a prerequisite for bringing something different and of worth to universities.

[Good chaplaincy means], I suppose being able to offer something that helps enhance a sense of wellbeing in staff and students, that comes not from the perspective of psychiatry or medicine or those kinds of professional avenues, but from the perspective of the particular religious or philosophical position and practice [of a chaplain] and I think that’s what differentiates it from those other services, wellbeing and student support and so on. (Buddhist chaplain, traditional elite)

Living and working as an outworking of the integrity of one’s faith position leads us back to the possibility of mission, here not simply as something that the chaplain does alone, but as something which belongs to the community created around such integrity of faith.

We’re in a situation where confessional adherence is very slender…here is a sense in which one purpose of our chaplains is to commend the faith and that simply being there loitering with intent is not sufficient. I think therefore a good chaplaincy is something where the distinctiveness of the Christian gospel is manifest, it doesn’t have to be preached, and it certainly doesn’t have to be proselytised, but is evident and visible, not in the sense of a man with a dog collar sitting in a refectory, but in the sense of a community which is behaving differently. (Anglican Bishop, Cathedrals Group)

Clear vision

Managers sometimes responded to the question of what good chaplaincy work looks like by pointing to observed deficiencies

What’s the key vision for the service? For my service I know I want to do preventative work, I want to do promotional work, I want to do interventions. So I’ve got three strands of provision. I don’t know what [the chaplaincy’s] strands of provision would be. If they just came up with a framework and a model and then delivered on it to those areas, we would all understand it. (Head of Welfare, red brick)
Put positively, this manager seems to suggest that a clear vision is required not just for the sake of the chaplains themselves, but so that their work can be intelligible to others.

**Team working**

Again, it is a perceived deficiency that prompts the implication good chaplaincy requires effective team working, both within the chaplaincy team and between that team and other agencies within the university.

I think at the moment [we need a chaplaincy team] that is unified under a common sense of purpose and understanding about what the needs are of the institution, the student community and the staff community. One that understands the setting. So, they don’t try and do everything themselves. They know when they should refer. They know when they should raise concerns to authorities or to external agencies, or to the university itself, abiding by confidentiality as far as possible. (Director of Student Experience, red brick)

**Inner confidence**

Chaplains need an inner confidence in the value of their work, especially when this cannot always easily be demonstrated through the kinds of audit processes ubiquitously employed by universities.

In the particular university I am involved in [the challenge] I think is actually for the chaplains themselves, keeping the faith, curiously. Keeping the faith in the value of what they’re doing, not keeping the faith in terms of their belief. Many years ago I ran a workshop for chaplains which was what to do when nobody turns up… It’s the best attended workshop I ever put on. Which reflected the deep need of chaplains for reassurance in the value of their work. And I think that’s a challenge for individual chaplains to believe that the work is valuable and that it is not always clearly measurable - horrible word. (Catholic Bishops’ Representative, Cathedrals Group)

Another way of expressing this is the confidence for chaplains to live with an inevitable marginality.

I think [chaplaincy] has to see itself as serving the university as a community, and that might mean living with its marginality, living with discomfort, but ultimately it’s not there to replicate the church in miniature or to be a cosy community. (Head of Theology, Cathedrals Group)

Confidence in one’s purpose can be supported by independent spiritual direction.

[I]t’s important…that we, as a Chaplaincy team… get our own spiritual nourishment and that we are also…getting spiritual direction too and I think…that should be offered, the university should offer that… to maybe have someone from outside to come and give us spiritual direction. (Assistant Roman Catholic chaplain, Cathedrals Group)

The only manager who appreciates this requirement for inner confidence is an academic head of theology. In general, as we have observed, when considering the prophetic and missional role of chaplains, university managers of chaplaincy do not generally seek to understand chaplains from within the perspective of the faith commitment that makes them who they are, even though this identity is integral to their appointment and recognition in the role. Given the highly secularised character of contemporary British life, and fairly low levels of religious literacy among the general population, perhaps this is unsurprising. Yet even within universities that retain traces of a secular ethos that imagines religion to be properly consigned to the very margins of campus life, some managers recognise chaplaincy as offering something unique and valuable to the life of the institution. Most do not use theological language to describe this, but their acknowledgement of practical and pastoral value suggests a changing orientation to chaplaincy in the broader sector, one that is explored in more detail in Chapter 4.
Chaplains’ ‘theological’ or belief models

This chapter has highlighted the value of chaplains having integrity of faith, that is, to be free to allow their beliefs and convictions to authentically shape their identity and practice. It has also suggested that genuine understanding of chaplains requires one to adopt an ‘insider’ perspective, to see the world as they do. Treating chaplains as a ‘black box’ that performs certain functions leads, at best, to a partial understanding of their motivations, needs and concerns. In this section, we seek to open up this ‘insider’ perspective by describing the models and motifs that shape their conception of their work.

When we examined the descriptions of their ‘primary aim’ given by the 367 chaplains who took part in our telephone interviews, it was only Christian chaplains, and a minority of these, who employed what we might call ‘theological’ language. However, when chaplains were interviewed face-to-face in our case study universities, some of the most unhesitating answers to the question, ‘Are there any particular theological models or motifs or ideas that you use to guide your work?’ came from non-Christian chaplains. Indeed, it was noticeable that a significant proportion of Christian chaplains struggled to find an immediate and coherent answer to that question and needed time and space to think it through.

What then were the theological models expressed by non-Christian chaplains? The following are a selection of approaches that were described to us in our case study interviews.62

A Buddhist model

The Buddhist Chaplain at the red brick university has been shaped by the Zen tradition of mindful meditation over a period of more than fifty years. It has taken deep roots, so that ‘frames and colours and underpins almost everything I do with staff and students’. The chaplain has found great merit in marrying this tradition with a sceptical philosophical approach as exemplified by the ancient Greek figures of Pyrrho and Sextus Empiricus, and the more recent (early modern) figure of Montaigne. Why so? Reflecting an approach that is at least in part formulated as a counter response to secular materialism, this Buddhist chaplain comments ‘…[S]ceptics argue for a kind of realist position, they try and see things as they are and to try and separate out their own judgements and opinions and preferences from the way things are’. The way things are’ is how this chaplain translates the central Buddhist concept of Dharma, which thus acts as a common prism through which religious practice (mindful meditation) and philosophical intuition (challenging assumptions) meet. Chaplaincy thus becomes a way of ‘trying to see clearly the situation in which we find ourselves…to…enable an individual to be better able to reflect on that situation and [so] change their relationship with that situation’. The result is ‘usually felt to be beneficial’.

A Jewish model

Also at the red brick university, the Jewish chaplain singles out the notion described by the Hebrew word Tikkun which means, ‘repairing the world’. How does this apply to chaplaincy? ‘Judaism has a principle that God can’t be everywhere all the time because we would all then be perfect’. Instead, God is understood to have withdrawn from the world (zimsum), a notion which explains why the world is experienced as less than perfect. Consequently, ‘our purpose in being here is to repair the world, to try and fix [it at] that point [where]…evil, if you want to put it that way, comes into the world’. The beauty of the notion of Tikkun is that it is not asking for everything to be repaired at once. Rather, one engages in one repair at a time, rendering this idea applicable to chaplaincy in a robustly practical sense.

A Pagan model

The Wiccan Rede, ‘An [if] it harm none do what you will’, was cited as the key principle by the Pagan chaplain at our traditional elite university. It is seen as, ‘very much a golden rule’, and understood as ‘a positive morality’. This tenet functions as a way to navigate through the ambiguous moral choices presented by a complex world where often there is no straightforward perfect option. Because it is virtually, ‘inevitable that harm potentially can happen from almost any behaviour’, it is essential to consider the possibility of harm before taking action. Discerning potential harm might not, however, preclude a particular course, ‘as long as you’ve thought about it and weighed it up’ and still consider it the best available in the circumstances. Here then is an accessible moral tradition that can guide both chaplains and those who seek their counsel.

---

62. While we made a concerted attempt to interview Muslim chaplains, unfortunately, for reasons of chaplains’ availability, we were not able to do this as part of our case study investigations. Our survey of 367 chaplains includes Muslim perspectives, but these are presented in more fragmentary form and so do not lend themselves to the construction of an extended account, which is the model we have opted to use in the present chapter.
A Sikh model

The Sikh chaplain at the post-1992 university relates his approach to chaplaincy to the tradition of Amrit Velā, a ‘very, very peaceful time’ three hours before sunrise, which he uses to prepare himself for the day ahead. He affirms the importance of the meditation he practices at that time as valuable for all people, ‘whatever faith they’re in’, as it enables him to get away from the distractions of normal everyday life and focus on ‘what we’re really here for’. It is through this practice that he reaches out to God and reflects on his orientation to life: ‘just reflecting on what we’re doing here, are we doing things which are hurting anybody, are we doing things which are going to…bring us closer to God?’ It is an experiential model that has a universalist flavour insofar as its efficacy does not depend on any belief or affiliation that is tradition-specific. In this sense, its appeal parallels the facilitation of mindfulness practice among Buddhist (and some Christian) chaplains, although the culturally particular associations of Sikhism may hinder it from securing broader participation in the same way.

A humanist model

The Head of Pastoral Support at Humanists UK, operating at a national level, points to the efficacy of, ‘active listening…beautifully timed questions and…ideal feedback’. What is referred to as, ‘the theoretical [basis] of [the] humanist model’ is ‘unconditional positive regard’ towards the person seeking support. This ‘create[s] a safe space for people’ by both granting and respecting the freedom of the individual. Such a proposition is close to the person-centred approach pioneered by psychologist Carl Rogers in the 1960s which takes unconditional love as its primary motivation. ‘We don’t [just] want to be giving people advice and support…and trying to cheer them up’ instead ‘the objective is to provide the other with encouragement to realise full autonomy’, which is ‘not an easy skill’.

Christian models

Because Christians formed a much larger proportion of our case study interviews with chaplains, we offer a more extensive account below. Such an extensive discussion is also justified by the sheer diversity among models encountered among Christian chaplains. No particular motif is shared by more than three chaplains. Although authors have sought to provide Christian theological models for chaplaincy (see Chapter 1), each practitioner seems to prefer to alight upon theological motifs that arise organically from their experience and make most sense to them at any particular time. In general, ‘motif’ is probably a more accurate term to use than ‘model’, because what interviewees offered were more particular ideas that serve to inspire and prompt action. Here, then, is a brief survey of some of those motifs which, although separated out for clarity, should not be read as mutually exclusive.

- **Accompaniment**: The idea of journey, the Anglican chaplain at our red brick university pointed out, is a ‘key biblical theme’. In particular, this chaplain wished to focus on, ‘the ministry of…Jesus walking with people and experiencing life with people and teaching through accompanying those on a journey’. This then becomes a paradigm of relationship that can guide chaplaincy. ‘[S]tudents are at this most exceptional stage of their life and they need people just to walk with them, just to make sense of that’.

- **Community**: Rooted in the pattern of informal communities that formed through gathering around the ministry of particular saints shortly after the Reformation, the 1960s campus Roman Catholic chaplain draws upon, ‘the model that we call communities’. Thus, ‘we provide hospitality and then people get to know each other, and…make friends, and we…form a community’. In this model the chaplain acts as both host and mentor.

- **Eucharist**: Catholic chaplains looked towards the Eucharist as a primary and shaping locus of ministry. For the priest at our Cathedrals Group university, the Eucharist provides a context of profound acceptance: ‘[I]t’s not demanding on [those who attend] in any way. They can just be there and they’re not being asked to do [anything].’ The regularity of its offering also means it can become a fixed point in people’s lives, and so a predictable occasion of support. ‘I think having that regular time for the Eucharist…means that if something’s going on in people’s lives, they know they can just turn up’.

- **Image of God**: A fundamental motif of the Judaeo-Christian tradition is that people are made in the ‘image and likeness of God’. Precisely what this means has been endlessly debated, but for the Methodist chaplain at the Cathedrals Group university it is, ‘that you see the face of God in the other’. Such a perspective is bound to shape...
action. It means, ‘treating every single person that we meet like they’re made in the image of God, you know, like they’re…precious to God…embracing people as equal[s] and loving people’.

- **Incarnation**: Ignatius of Loyola is credited with introducing a new way of praying and so a new way of looking at the world. His method involves, ‘believing that God is in all, God is in every situation, in every person’. It is thus an incarnational perspective which holds that, ‘Jesus is alive and living today, now, in every person, [and] situation.’ The challenge, says the Roman Catholic lead chaplain at the Cathedrals Group university, is ‘living that out’.

- **Kingdom of God**: In the synoptic gospels the fundamental and consistent message of Jesus concerns the inauguration of a new state of affairs which he refers to as ‘the Kingdom of God’. This Cathedrals Group chaplain holds that what Jesus did then, he can do now. ‘I want to see Jesus impact people and I want to see the Kingdom of God transform people’s lives’. What would such transformation look like? ‘I don’t think [it] has to look like the way people think it has to look like, like in church, it doesn’t have to look like decisions for Jesus and hands up in a meeting, and attendance at a weekly event’. Instead the Kingdom begins to take shape, ‘when you build community… when you build a safe place… when you promote grace and love and peace…[when] you provide opportunities for students to thrive and be the best versions of themselves’.

- **Light**: A profound theme of John’s Gospel, already foreshadowed in its famous prologue, is light. ‘I’m all about be the light’ says this Roman Catholic assistant chaplain, and being ‘the light for others so that they can see Christ in what they do’. Slightly embarrassed by its simplicity the chaplain glosses, ‘I know it sounds really childlike but [that’s the model]…I would really work from’ (Cathedrals Group).

- **The margin as the heart of things**: Chaplains have long spoken about engaging in a ministry on the edges, and this report demonstrates that view is still current. But what does it mean to think this through Christologically? ‘I used to give a talk to Women’s Guilds…[on] Ministry on the Margins’ explains the Christian lead chaplain at the traditional elite university. ‘[T]hen I realised that actually my understanding was 180˚ different from that’. Time spent in chaplaincy had led to the realisation that what might seem at first to be the margin, was actually more like a true centre. Chaplaincy, ‘may seem on the surface as the margin of the church and the chaplains…on the edge of things, but increasingly I…see …[chaplaincy ministry] at the absolute leading edge of human thought and discovery’. Two pivotal books,65 which in different ways focus on a theology of the dying and dead Christ, had persuaded the chaplain of this. ‘I see power as completely relativised by love and relativised by the cross’ which in turn makes the true centre the apparent periphery in a presently out-of-centre world.

- **Parable of the Mustard Seed**: Jesus compares the Kingdom of God to a mustard seed: the smallest of seeds grows into a large tree66, ‘[This] is…my motif or is my image’ says the Cathedrals Group Roman Catholic assistant chaplain. ‘I always go to [it]…because I think…we’re also growing with our own faith… and I think we’ve got so much to learn to be a big tree’. This motif is also applied to students: ‘I’m starting to see them grow’.

- **Prayer**: Prayer may seem like an obvious resource, but it was very rarely mentioned. ‘I pray for the university, I believe in the power of prayer’ says one Cathedrals Group chaplain. The practice of prayer becomes a way in which to give oneself to the particular geographical location of one’s ministry: ‘[it is] for me to see this as my focus and my field and…[as] I walk round the Halls of Residence during the summer when no students are in there…I pray for the students that are coming’. This approach means, ‘just sitting over this place and caring about it and praying about it and hearing God for it’.

- **Vocation**: Vocation need not be a narrow concept that applies only to recognised forms of ministry; it can be as broad as creation if it concerns discerning one’s purpose. The Anglican chaplain at our red brick university relates: ‘the conversations…I’ve been having this term have been around vocation…I had a huge number of students… going, oh my goodness, am I doing the right thing… this is going to be almost my identity for potentially the rest of my life?’ For this chaplain the question of vocation is a profoundly theological question, but its broader application to chaplaincy requires translation. ‘I’m not perhaps always using the term God if they’re not religious’, rather vocation concerns ‘your life’s core and…where your life is leading and what people say about you and what you’ve been gifted [in]’. To this extent it is, ‘a very simple conversation and one that I think…all chaplains see’.

---

66. See, for example, Mark 4:30-32.
Two additional observations are worth making. First, some chaplains are able to supply more than one guiding motif. Where theological reflection is undertaken, it seems to encourage further reflection. Second, a disproportionate number of the considered responses to the question of theological model came from Cathedrals Group chaplains. This suggests, as has been mooted, that these universities provide a conducive environment for Christian theological reflection and explicitly theological expression of purpose.

Chaplaincy’s unique contribution: Students’ views

It seems probable that such theological shaping of chaplaincy informs its unique contribution. In any case, our student survey demonstrates a strong belief that chaplains offer something distinctive, something that is not replicated by others in the university. For example, we asked for levels of agreement or disagreement with the statement: ‘Chaplains provide pastoral support in a way that professional student support services cannot.’ The results are convincing.

Overall, those who ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree’ comprise 79.8%. Even if we exclude those who identify as ‘religious’ and ‘not religious but spiritual’, so as to include just those who are ‘unsure’ or ‘not spiritual or religious’, those in agreement with distinctive support provided by chaplaincy still constitute 64.3% of the sample, showing that it is not necessary to wear spiritual or religious spectacles to see the peculiar quality of the offering made by chaplains.

That student opinion is settled on this matter is demonstrated in the way they responded to a related opinion statement: ‘If professional student services in my university worked effectively, there would be no need for university chaplaincy’.

---

**Figure 2.9: Students’ responses to the statement ‘Chaplains provide pastoral support in a way professional support services cannot’ (%)**
Only 8.7% agreed with this statement, 10.4% were unsure and a clear majority of 80.7% disagreed.

The same confidence is borne out by comments made by students in our survey. For example, ‘[Chaplains] are great for pastoral support and practical advice in a way that student services aren’t – I have used both and both are important and necessary’ (Christian, home student, traditional elite). In this next response, it is the open-endedness of the conversation that is prized: ‘[chaplains] can listen to students and provide help or advice without a predetermined plan, agenda, or expected end goal as usually professional services do’ (Christian, EU student, traditional elite). There is also recognition that possessing a vocation for one’s work makes the difference: ‘[chaplains] are always there, you can always talk to them. You don’t need an appointment, they have a vocation, and they always want to help’ (Christian, home student, traditional elite).

### Figure 2.10: Students' responses to the statement 'If professional student services worked effectively in my university, there would be no need for university chaplaincy' (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 8.7% agreed with this statement, 10.4% were unsure and a clear majority of 80.7% disagreed.

### Chaplaincy's unique contribution: Managers' views

We asked managers in our case study universities: ‘Do you think chaplaincy makes a unique contribution to university life, and if so, what is that uniqueness?’ Only one interviewee was uncertain about the qualifier ‘unique’: ‘I don’t know about unique. It plays an important contribution to university life… It’s important to some people.’ (Academic Registrar, 1960s campus). However, this was the exception that proved the rule, and all others agreed with the proposition. Moreover, their comments on what chaplains exactly contribute to campus life reflect how the perception of chaplaincy as a niche service relevant only to students of faith is no longer normative among those responsible for managing student support. This affirmation of a breadth of relevance was accompanied by a range of comments on the distinct roles played by chaplains in everyday university life.
For example, many emphasised chaplains’ relative independence from university structures as a positive feature. As suggested above, managers may find it hard to understand the existential position of chaplains and the personal commitments and requirements needed to act with authenticity and integrity. They appear to have little difficulty, however, in recognising the unique reach and value of chaplaincy’s outward manifestations. It is the very differences that make chaplaincy hard to fit fully within the niches of a typical university structure, that managers see as conferring an advantage. For some, this rests in how chaplains occupy a different place within campus life, being somebody, as the General Registrar of the 1960s campus university put it, ‘who is not implicated in the machinery of the university’, or offering ‘an alternative way into things’, according to the Cathedrals Group Pro-Vice Chancellor. Chaplains are viewed as set apart from the rest of the university, an arrangement that generates advantages of perspective and distance. Other managers stressed the institutional breadth of Chaplaincy: ‘the one unit that crosses absolutely everything’, according to the Director of Student Services at the traditional elite university. In this respect, chaplains are viewed as possessing a strategic advantage in their capacity to build relationships across the entire university, and hence bring together issues, concerns and resources that might otherwise remain isolated and unaddressed. Others emphasised how this capacity feeds into the building of a sense of shared community, perhaps through the chaplain’s role in ceremonial occasions that bring the university together. In some cases, this capacity is extended into the local community, with the chaplain effectively serving as a hub for the social capital that can be generated between a university and its locale. As the Director of Legal Services at the post-1992 university put it, ‘that bridging the university to the wider community within the city. I think that is so important and I think we would lose that if we didn’t have that individual in that role.’

Close to a kind of prophetic role, and rooted in the possibilities that come from the way chaplaincy can transcend university structures, is their ability to call into question the meaningfulness of the bureaucratic language that tends to take root. As a Senior Tutor at the red brick university put it:

…there are certain, let’s call them intuitions, maybe moral intuitions …that in the public sphere…often get lost and what happens is, particularly in a newer university like this one…they get lost in a kind of bullshit jargon bureaucratese and what the chaplain does is…continually bring those [moral] intuitions into the public sphere, [he or she] tries to translate, tries to remind people that there is something other than getting and spending…’we waste our powers’ …and that there is more to life.

One Head of Human Resources puts the point more bluntly: ‘I think they provide very much a sort of moral compass’ (post-1992).

This tendency to recognise and value the broad reach of chaplaincy across the university community, together with the benefits this confers on a campus-wide scale, means university managers often see chaplains as assets to their institution. And while they recognise the distinctive benefits of a faith-based perspective for those who share it, chaplaincy is viewed as important chiefly because it has a special capacity to transcend the differences and structures that ordinarily define university life. This means managers often maintain unexpected, constructive and sometimes creative, professional relationships with their chaplain colleagues, and these will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter 4.

Transcendence versus integration: A fundamental tension

This research demonstrates that university managers display a near universal appreciation that chaplaincy contributes something unique to university life, something that cannot be duplicated by any other service or group of staff. Yet, there is an underlying tension to unpick: managers articulate that chaplaincy is valued because of its ability to transcend the structures and practices of the university. Yet, when managers are asked to convey their vision for the development of chaplaincy over the next five years, a considerable number desire a closer integration of chaplaincy into precisely the university structures they had been applauded for rising beyond.

Here, a Director of Student Experience calls for greater integration.

I think a team that’s been recruited, understanding what their responsibilities are, the limits of what they should and shouldn’t do, understanding how they sit within the university structure. Not on the outside…but at the heart of it, but also at the heart of other support systems that are available for staff and students and working harmoniously together. (red brick)

This view is echoed by someone holding a parallel position at another university.

I think my own vision for support services is about integrated and cross working, and multi-disciplinary teams. And certainly very high on my list that chaplaincy is integrating within that work. (Deputy Director of Student Services, post-1992)
Closer analysis reveals that it is not the same people arguing for both sides of this inconsistency between transcendence and integration. We are hearing, largely, two separate groups of managers who are defined not so much by their role as their location. The majority of voices in support of chaplaincy’s transcendence of university structure come from the traditional elite and Cathedrals Group, whereas those arguing for closer integration with university structures come predominantly from the 1960s campus, post-1992 and red brick universities.

Chaplains are not averse to future planning, but unlike university managers they have no single set of common goals, but many ambitions from new or improved chaplaincy spaces, to better team working, through to spending more time out of the office. For others the hope is to be able to sustain what they are already doing. However, some chaplains sound a cautionary note about aligning closely with the strategic language of the university.

I don’t have great strategic aims because I think they distract from that core point of being available. I would…prefer to attend less meetings and do more passing the time of day with students. (Anglican Chaplain, red brick)

That sentiment finds resonance here: ‘I think [chaplaincy]’s effective when it’s casual and when it’s not named and when it’s not written down.’ (Free Church chaplain, Cathedrals Group). No university manager holds this view.

The wide range of hoped-for futures among chaplains is probably another demonstration of the *ad hominem* nature of good and effective chaplaincy; it revolves around the peculiar gifts and strengths of those engaged in the task as this intersects with idiosyncrasies of the university for which they work.

This chapter has described how university chaplaincy is conceived by those who have various stakes in its enactment. Next we turn to this enactment itself. To what extent is conception and intention realised in concrete chaplaincy practice?
Chapter 3:  
Experiences of chaplaincy work

Following Chapter 1’s overview of chaplaincy provision across the UK and Chapter 2’s exploration of different perspectives on the aim of chaplaincy, this chapter turns to the question of what work chaplains do and who they work with. It then discusses how this works in the five case study universities, drawing on interviews with chaplains.

Findings from telephone interviews with 367 chaplains:  
Who do chaplains work with?

Asked to choose from a list the groups they worked most closely with during a typical week, chaplains mentioned students of their own religious tradition most frequently (nearly two-thirds said this). The second most popular answer was ‘other chaplaincy staff’ (39.2%). Their answers reflect a strong commitment to those beyond their own religious tradition, as the third most common answer was ‘non-religious students’ (38.4%), who they worked with more closely than the local religious community or staff of their own religious tradition. Chaplains work more with students than staff, and students of other religions or beliefs came next, followed by international students (who themselves vary in their religion and belief commitments). As for working with staff, after chaplaincy staff, the order reverses compared to student work: instead of staff of their own faith, chaplains work most with non-religious staff and student services staff. They work least closely with university managers, the Students Union, religious organisations outside the university and the local religious community.

Figure 3.1: Chaplains’ responses to the question ‘In a typical week, which three groups do you work most closely with?’ (%)
Comparing Christian and non-Christian chaplains reveals differences. Christians were much more likely to work with non-religious students and non-religious staff than non-Christian chaplains were. Is this because they are more likely to work full-time, be paid and have an office, so they are more accessible to the whole university community? The answer becomes clear when paid chaplains are compared with volunteers: paid chaplains, of all traditions, demonstrate the same pattern of more work with non-religious students and staff, and with university managers.

Chaplains from minority religions, in contrast, use their limited time to support students of their own faith. Non-Christian chaplains were more likely than Christians to work closely with the local religious community, religious organisations outside the university and other chaplaincy staff. Because non-Christian chaplains spend less time in chaplaincy, the time they spend with other chaplaincy staff takes up a greater proportion of their work, which explains why they are more likely than Christians to name chaplaincy staff as one of the groups they work most closely with.

What do chaplains do?

Overall, the (especially Anglican) chaplaincy tradition of serving the whole community is alive and well. This is reflected in data about activities performed in a typical week, with 78.5% selecting ‘building community’, the second most popular answer, after ‘pastoral support for students’ (87.2%). This reflects Chapter 2’s finding that chaplains emphasised pastoral, religious and presence as their key aims.

Asked to select the four activities they spend most time on, chaplains selected pastoral support or counselling for students (placed together as it is hard to distinguish between them) as their major activity. After this comes ‘building community’, again a relational activity. They are involved in a lot of administrative work. Next they spend most time on pastoral support or counselling for staff.

![Figure 3.2: Chaplains’ responses to the question ‘Which four activities do you spend the most time on?’ (%)](image)

67. This list represents a pre-set list of activities offered to chaplains to select from, developed in conjunction with our advisory board. It is not an exhaustive list, and activities carried out with university managers or on university committees is missing; the extent of this work at some universities became obvious during the case study stage.
Some examples of ‘other’, accounting for just 3.8%, were doing research and contributing to the university’s ‘Prevent intervention team’, walking a dog around the campus and baking a weekly cake, committee membership for the national Roman Catholic chaplains conference, and convening a peace committee. There are no significant differences between the type of work done and the type of university a chaplain works at, except that chaplains work most closely with student services staff at post-1992 universities (probably because, as our analysis of who manages chaplains indicates, chaplains are more likely to be managed under student services there68, and work most closely with Students Unions at Cathedrals Group universities (perhaps because at these universities chaplains are more integrated with the SU into student welfare within a shared understanding of a singular community based on Christian values).

Interview findings at case study universities: Who do chaplains work with and what work do they do with them?

When chaplains at the case study universities were asked similar questions in a more open way (‘Which kinds of people do you work most closely with? Can you give some examples of the sort of work you do with them?’), they said a great deal about work with students, and much less about work with staff, or general work that was not specifically for either group.

Work with students

Hospitality was a major theme. Chaplains talked about providing a welcome in the chaplaincy to those who come in, in the main general chaplaincy space (whatever form that took), and, if relevant, other chaplaincy buildings (for instance, if there was a separate Catholic chaplaincy building). Hospitality was seen by many as the most basic and fundamental thing that chaplains could offer. As this part-time 1960s campus Methodist chaplain said, ‘I simply act on the chaplaincy rota to provide a presence, a chaplaincy presence on [names day] mornings, offer coffee and tea and whatever for those students that come in and chat to them if they want to be talked to.’

As Dunlop’s 2017 study of chaplaincy found, ‘being there’ was important. The Cathedrals Group Roman Catholic lead chaplain said:

A lot of just being there sometimes, encouraging both students and staff to use the space there either to work if they want to, to relax or to socialise and to join us for lunch on a [weekly basis]. So, I think after that, support and just being alongside. Gradually you can see students relaxing over from the first week of freshers to popping in for coffee or just sitting and reading or playing the piano or just meeting with friends. So, it becomes a space where people can either pass through or relax and be.

This chaplaincy, like some others, provided a weekly lunch, the purpose of which was ‘building…rapport’ (Roman Catholic assistant chaplain, Cathedrals Group).

Acting as host is possible only when chaplains have a chaplaincy space from which to host; as the lead chaplain interviews showed, two of the 99 universities’ chaplaincies lacked a single permanent space to operate from, and this was likely to be the case for some of the universities where no one was available for interview.

The first week of the academic year, variously called ‘induction’, ‘welcome’ or ‘freshers’ week, was a time of significant activity, as chaplains geared up to welcome new students69. Chaplains also run social events, mostly inside the university, sometimes beyond it. Activities they mentioned included a knitting group, a meal and debate event and a football team.

Social events were mentioned most by Catholic chaplains, and included sandwiches after mass and trips out to nearby places of interest, pilgrimages, film nights and quiz nights. At the Cathedrals Group university, the main role of one chaplain was to organise university-wide social events, and these included film nights and dinners, in addition to a weekly soup-and-sandwich-style lunch, which chaplains served to anyone who turned up. Catholic chaplains sometimes had a separate building, with facilities for worship, discussion, cooking, socialising or even living accommodation for some students. The post-1992 university’s Roman Catholic assistant chaplain spoke about this as a ‘home from home’ for international students.

68. 26.9% of chaplains at post-1992 universities are line-managed by someone in student services, compared to an average of 16.4% across the whole sample (p= <0.001).

69. The IDEALS study of interfaith activity on campuses in the USA confirms that induction is an important time for student religious learning, and engaging with religious activities during ‘orientation’ often helps students develop ‘appreciative attitudes’ to religious diversity, so chaplains are right to prioritise this week (Rockenbach et al. 2018: 7-8).
Endorsing the telephone interview findings, chaplains at the case studies said that the student group they worked most with was students of their own religion:

I represent the Catholic church to the university and to the students there but...we’re not proselytising or anything like that, we’re just...that presence in the university for those students that feel that they might want support (assistant Roman Catholic chaplain, post-1992)

I get involved in the Sikh society proactively...I’m visible, they know who I am, they can come to me if needed and I actually go and talk to them, they ask me to talk to them as well (Sikh chaplain, post-1992)

I work with Jewish students and Jewish staff with any specific problems they have about Judaism (Jewish chaplain, red brick)

Working with students of their own religion, chaplains often organised spiritual development activities. Christian chaplains’ activities were more established and included Bible studies, discussions of books by prominent theologians and prayer groups, although they sometimes attracted modest numbers. For chaplains from other beliefs and religions, activities had to be created from scratch or negotiated over. The Pagan chaplain at the traditional elite university invites students to off-campus Pagan meetings, to support their Pagan practice. Before the Pagan chaplain took on the chaplaincy role, Pagan students had asked to use the chaplaincy for Pagan society meetings, but were given a list of things they weren’t allowed to do, including drinking alcohol in the chaplaincy, and using Ouija boards. Concerned that this amounted to discrimination, the Pagan chaplain stepped in and negotiated on their behalf, leading to an invitation to take on the role of Pagan chaplain. The traditional elite Buddhist chaplain saw supporting Buddhist students’ spiritual development as their key role:

The kind of work would vary from offering a listening ear if someone is upset to possible bereavement work if somebody’s lost a parent, I do quite a bit of that with staff actually, bereavement support, and then attending funerals on behalf [of] the university if say, a student sadly two years [ago] committed suicide, so again they will ask one of us, whoever’s available, to attend on...behalf of the staff of the university.

The post-1992 university’s Roman Catholic assistant chaplain said:

On the one hand you play that...student support role in that you are there as a kind of counsellor...are there to listen and to be non-judgemental, to just provide that safe space that students can express whatever it is in a confidential place...Then distinctively we offer as a Catholic chaplain that faith perspective as well, that someone can come and know that if they are of that faith, that they can find someone who knows the situation they’re in... they can kind of identify maybe easier with them if they’re from that same tradition, if they’re coming with a particular problem and...from our tradition we can kind of identify, I can see why that might be an issue for you as a Catholic.
The traditional elite lead Christian chaplain’s answer summarises the extent and regularity of pastoral work with students:

I offer pastoral care to students and staff and in any given week I would see about perhaps ten people in that way, one-to-one in this office usually. Proportionally to the student / staff body… it’s about 3:1 students to staff that I see. I see students sometimes just once, but sometimes for a few times and occasionally I get into an ongoing pastoral relationship where they come quite regularly, over more than a year.

Student societies of the chaplains’ own religion occupy some chaplains’ time. The chaplaincy may provide a venue for religious student society meetings; the Cathedrals Group Roman Catholic lead chaplain gave the example of the weekly Christian Union meeting and the fortnightly Catholic Society. Most of this activity is on campus, but chaplaincy can be a contact point to the local religious community, as the post-1992 university’s Sikh chaplain said:

There’s a Sikh society which I’m kind of involved in, they invite me to give talks, to respond to particular sort of questions or concerns that anybody might have within the community and the Sikh society particularly. The Sikh society also does lots of activities, for example they’re working with the homeless in [university city] and they make food…so I get involved in that.

Chaplaincies occasionally host non-religious student societies, with African Caribbean and sports societies being examples chaplains gave.

The next group of students chaplains talked about were non-religious students. The Roman Catholic assistant chaplain from the post-1992 university’s Sikh chaplain was:

I do work with some non-Christians and some other denominations as well and I hope that I’m able to offer them the same kind of safe space. I find that I do a lot of listening…sometimes students just need to talk to you and just need to unload or just want a bit of advice, you know, when things are getting a bit on top of them.

The Jewish red brick university chaplain said something similar:

I work with students. The most important thing I think is being a chaplain, a member of a multi-faith team, who is here to talk to anybody of any faith or none, or as we prefer to say, any world view, and act as a semi-independent listening ear.

Non-religious students sometimes come to know of the chaplaincy through a religious friend, the post-1992 university Roman Catholic chaplain commented, and get involved in volunteering in chaplaincy activities with friends.

International students, with or without a personal faith, are another group who use chaplaincy. At the 1960s campus, a local Friends International group worked alongside chaplains to support international students. The Catholic chaplain here and in other universities commented that international students constitute the majority of Catholic students, and this led to intercultural learning:

It’s predominantly international students that we get and the university is very international…When you have international students a lot of them will be from Catholic countries, perhaps middle Eastern Europe and some Asian countries, Africa and Latin America, so there’s a very broad mix, I think it’s probably the most international gathering or group…which is very nice…it allows us to have international meals and things like that. People like to get to know about each other’s cultures.

The students that I mainly deal with are predominantly Catholic…and they’re predominantly international students. We have a large proportion of international students. They tend to be from Nigeria or Poland…that reflects the university as well, they have a large intake of Nigerian students and they tend to practice [their faith] and they tend to be quite enthusiastic which is great for us as a chaplaincy to be able to support them in that. (Roman Catholic assistant chaplain, post-1992)

International students can experience challenges integrating into an unfamiliar culture, but they are not the only group of marginalised students who chaplains work with. Several chaplains support students marginalised because of disability, refugee status, LGBT sexuality, or being lonely.

70. Friends International is a national Christian charity dedicated to supporting international students in the UK. See Chapter 5 for further discussion of this organisation.
postgraduates; chaplains’ tendency to work with marginalised students broadly reflects our student survey findings (see Chapter 6). As the Cathedrals Group Methodist chaplain summarised:

The groups that naturally come in, a lot of those students will be students that are perhaps slightly sort of on the outskirts. They might not have a huge number of friends, they might be mature students, they might have a disability, I think they feel welcomed and cared for in the chaplaincy.

An unanticipated area of chaplaincy work with students mentioned by several chaplains was voluntary work: chaplains engage students in voluntary work in the local community. Examples mentioned includes an over-60s club that the Catholic chaplain and students help out at in the post-1992 university and homeless projects where students and chaplains serve food.

**Work with staff.**

Chaplains do three main types of work with staff: with their colleagues on the chaplaincy team; with university managers, departments and committees; and pastoral or spiritual development work for staff in the wider university.

In universities with a lead chaplain role, lead (invariably Christian) chaplains often manage the chaplaincy team, running team meetings, discussing issues with colleagues from different religious backgrounds, and working with an administrator, if they have one. The lead chaplain is also the chaplain who works most with the wider university management, including often the head of student services or wellbeing, and sometimes has a place on university committees:

I also do have regular meetings with some members of the university staff. I’m on the safeguarding committee, so we meet monthly. I tend to meet termly with the deputy vice-chancellor for a catch-up. I think the vice-chancellor delegated that because I used to meet with him. But it doesn’t matter because it means I’ve got a good relationship with him. Now I also have a good relationship with the deputy vice-chancellor. And we’ve got a new PVC...I’ve already made contact with her, and we’re going to meet up as well. And the registrar I have a relationship with. So I know quite a lot of the senior staff, and I meet with them. (Anglican chaplain, 1960s campus)

Chaplains can have, the chaplain continued, a university-wide network of relationships and contacts:

I try and identify who are Christian staff. I was left a list of contacts by my predecessor. So I’ve tried to build relationships with them and hook up with them from time to time, just to have a coffee, see how they are. And build friendships around the place if I can, just being a supportive member of staff. One or two people have been to see me about things that are on their mind, about health issues or work issues. I like being that independent voice rather than being an employee of [the university]. I appreciate being able to be that kind of critical friend, as it were…and also an objective voice with no axe to grind either way. I have relationships with the cleaners and porters and security staff. I take them cake…I find that people are incredibly helpful if you treat them properly, decently and politely. And people are very, very helpful. I’m always asking favours, and people are absolutely lovely.

Pastoral work with staff includes supporting academics with high workloads (Roman Catholic chaplain, priest, Cathedrals Group), and the red brick Buddhist and post-1992 university’s Anglican chaplain run mindfulness sessions for staff to help with this.

**Other types of chaplaincy work: religious services and inter-faith work**

Chaplaincy work is not always segregated as ‘for students’ or ‘for staff’, but involves a mixture of people and activities. Constituencies are blurred for two kinds of activities: religious services, and inter-faith work.

Chaplains run or facilitate religious services. The 1960s campus Anglican chaplain runs a weekly service that attracts up to a dozen:

I have a lunchtime service during term time, and that involves staff as well as students which is also quite a nice time for them to be able to sit around with no kind of barrier of hierarchy. I think the students find it slightly intimidating at times. But it’s good. They just build a different sort of relationship with staff that they generally don’t know from other departments.
At this university the Roman Catholic chaplain leads Mass on a Sunday in a university room, attracting 70 or 80 students, staff and families:

We have some members of staff who come to Mass but mostly students or people who were students who’ve done PhDs and are now members of staff in some cases…I think it’s a nice mixture, so we have some who are members of staff who bring their families or PhD students who have families…and then also students and, you know, quite an international community.

The 1960s campus universities often have greater need for services on campus due to the lack of places of worship in the vicinity. The red brick (non-lead) Anglican chaplain ran five weekly services, catering for university members and a local Christian community connected to the Christian trust responsible for the chaplaincy.

Inter-faith work also transcends the staff-student divide. At the post-1992 university the Anglican chaplain prioritised inter-faith work. He ensured facilities were available for different groups, persuading the university to open a new large Muslim prayer room and dedicating particular rooms within the chaplaincy building to them, bringing in separate washing facilities for male and female Muslim students, a Buddhist room which had recently become an LGBT room (with the Buddhists’ permission), and hosting an inter-faith library. While students were the majority of users of these facilities, they were also open to staff and the local community, which lacked such facilities.

What do chaplains seek to achieve through their work?

Whether chaplains’ work and constituency reflect what they sought to do and who they sought to work with is an important question. Asked ‘What did you seek to achieve through your chaplaincy work during the last academic year? How successful do you think you were at doing this?’ chaplains sought primarily to work with students (offering hospitality, social events and pastoral work, especially with those of their own religion). Occasionally the focus was work with staff, and for a mixed audience (particularly running acts of worship for the whole university community). Asked who they sought to work with, chaplains also spoke most about students: supporting their spiritual development through various activities, supporting them pastorally, building good relations with and between students. They occasionally mentioned non-student-specific work – building good inter-faith relations in the city and university, or raising the profile of chaplaincy within the university – but said little or nothing about seeking to work with staff. In other words, when chaplains work with staff, it happens on request and is secondary to their main intention, to work with the students.

How successful do chaplains perceive they are at achieving their aims?

Most chaplains feel they are moderately successful at achieving their aims. Being asked about this gave the opportunity to reflect on their experience. The Cathedrals Group Methodist chaplain reflected on learning about the need to set boundaries, since ‘chaplaincy isn’t just a nine to five kind of job, sometimes it’s a seven to eleven kind of job and that can be really difficult’. The Cathedrals Group Roman Catholic assistant chaplain reflected on moving from a job working with children:

I thought that transition might be difficult but actually I just kind of dived right into it and my main aim was to build a rapport with the students, to be visible all across campus. Not just to be stuck in a chaplaincy room but to actually go out and meet students and see where they’re at, that was my main focus, that was my thing that I wanted to kind of achieve during the year and I think, well I got my report tonight and I know it was quite positive.

The successes chaplains talked about were often about having built good relationships with students, reflecting their goal for their work. The Buddhist chaplain at the traditional elite university had built a small group of people interested in Buddhist meditation, and though the numbers were small, saw this as moderate success:

I suppose it was a success. It’s not a large group of people but that was never really the point. I think what’s important for me is that the people who are potentially interested know that we’re there and I’m not sure that we’re completely successful in that, it’s pretty low key but, but on the whole I think it’s served its purpose pretty well.

Chaplains occasionally reported increased number of people attending events, but they were more concerned with depth or quality of work. Building relationships is a gradual process, they observed:

It takes them a little while to realise I’m okay, the new students coming in. I think partly it’s an age barrier. Partly it’s particularly with the Afro Caribbean students,
their pastors are really up on a pedestal and are unapproachable. So for them to see me as a friendly figure, or approachable, takes them a little while to get around that way of thinking...When you get past three years, and start seeing them from the beginning all the way through and seeing them graduate that’s a sense of accomplishment. I’ve invested in this person, and I can see they’ve changed and grown. It’s lovely. (Anglican chaplain, 1960s campus)

The post-1992 university’s assistant Catholic chaplain contrasted working with Catholic student societies at traditional elite universities and post-1992 universities:

A lot of Catholic chaplaincies depend heavily on a thriving Catholic society and the initiative of Catholic students, so if you look at [names a traditional elite university] there’s a thriving Catholic society which has been going for fifty years or so and that, you’ve got that kind of core of students that helps to support and create that community. In the newer universities you don’t tend to have that...From talking to other Catholic chaplains, particularly those in similar style universities to me, they are in a similar situation in that...if they’re looking at ministering to those Catholic students...you have to kind of search them out. So I think I’ve been successful in building that Catholic community, but also trying to make it open and inclusive and to also help those other students that come, that want to access that support.

Chaplains mentioned challenges including irregular working hours, divisions between different Christian student societies reluctant to work together, unexpected changes within the chaplaincy (for instance the move to a multi-faith model) and individual difficult students (one chaplain had been bullied by an intimidating student).

Conclusion

Who chaplains work with and what they do are intertwined. Chaplains work most with students, especially those of their own religion, but also with students of different and no particular faith. With these students they do pastoral work, with one-to-one support taking up considerable amounts of their time, and work that is specifically religious, conducting services and running inter-faith events, some of which connect students with staff and the local community. With students they run group activities and welcome religious student societies to use the chaplaincy space. Chaplains’ presence in a defined chaplaincy space is important, ‘being there’ to act as host and welcome whoever comes in. With staff, chaplains act both as colleagues in supporting student welfare and chaplains there to support staff needing religious or pastoral guidance. Chaplains’ work reflects quite closely their aims, and though often modest, chaplains generally think that they have been moderately successful at achieving their intentions for chaplaincy work.
Chapter 4: Chaplains’ relationships with the wider university

Introduction

Like prison, army and hospital chaplains, university chaplains often serve institutions which affirm different values from the religious or belief-based organisations to which they belong. As a consequence, their reception is neither predictable nor consistent, a predicament arguably heightened by the tendency for some to view university as somewhere religion has no legitimate place, perhaps even as an educational process that should debunk or eradicate religion. Indeed, some universities in the UK were established on a secular basis, and maintain an institutional discomfort with religion that translates into a wariness towards chaplaincy. At the same time, a number of sector-wide changes – not least the growing numbers of international students – have made religious identities difficult to ignore, while the introduction of new legislation on discrimination and counter-terrorism have placed legal obligations on universities as public bodies that impact on how they manage faith-based support.

Such developments have their origins in national or international shifts, but they impact universities through organisational structures and campus cultures at the local level. Moreover, the work of chaplains is only fully understood when considered in light of the organisational contexts that frame it. The present chapter is about these organisational contexts, and draws upon our findings in mapping how chaplains and chaplaincy functions within the different types of university found within the UK higher education sector.

How chaplains relate to the broader university

Based on the evidence gathered for this report, chaplains’ relationships with academic departments in their universities varied considerably, from those who admitted they had very limited contact – reacting to individual needs when occasionally called upon to do so – to a more integrated arrangement. The latter was striking in the Cathedrals Group case study university, where the shared Christian ethos meant the value of chaplaincy was more widely acknowledged and the presence of chaplains more often welcomed. The lead Roman Catholic chaplain commented,

I think we as Chaplains…can actually approach any academic or any Dean…about inviting them to a service or…to a gathering, but also maybe if we have a concern about students or if they have concerns about students…we try to build a safety net in, without talking too much about it, among ourselves really, just keeping an eye on vulnerable students…also we are geographically central… and we work at this building up relations, especially outside term time, when the students have gone and all the staff are here. We try to just support as best we can, offer a listening ear or a cup of tea or whatever the case may be…

Here we see the ways in which an established culture of chaplaincy support is integrated into the working life of the university, so that academic staff call upon chaplains about student support issues and chaplains themselves feel able to approach academic staff about their own wellbeing. This was evident in other universities to a degree, but varied, mostly in relation to the lead chaplain’s embeddedness in the institution, either informally through personal relationships, or formally through structures of line management. A number of examples of both are discussed later in this chapter.

Beyond pastoral support and referrals, some chaplains were also invited to contribute to teaching within academic departments. Sometimes chaplains have formal teaching responsibilities as part of their job, as did a voluntary Jewish chaplain who also taught in the business school, or a Sikh chaplain who worked full-time running degree programmes for a communications department. At the Cathedrals Group university, a more integrated structure had academic members of staff taking on chaplaincy responsibilities, their formal role bridging academic and pastoral concerns. In other universities, chaplains are more likely to be invited to contribute the occasional lecture within a Theology or Religious Studies programme, although we also found evidence of wider engagement, their professional skills being drawn on as human capital within different university departments. The post-1992 university lead chaplain had built a range of relationships across his university, and the trust with which he was regarded was reflected in how a range of departments were open to his involvement. He commented:

I get involved with the education department doing stuff on spirituality in the classroom and I go into the politics and history, do a little bit about community organising…we work with the psychology department,

71. This is not to forget that ‘secular’ can carry a variety of meanings, including institutional orientations to religion ranging from indifference to committed exclusion (see Dinham and Jones 2010; Gilliat-Ray 2000: 96-97).
with wellbeing and mindfulness, so things are kind of naturally working…

Sometimes chaplains encountered barriers to the building of relationships with academic departments, including a perception of prejudice against things religious or spiritual. These barriers do not appear to follow disciplinary lines, but emerge out of localised circumstances. For example, one chaplain said finding a way in to the department of Medicine had been difficult, while at a different university Medicine was claimed by the lead chaplain to be the department with which he had the strongest relationship. Indeed, this was echoed in comments made by the Medical School manager, who valued the chaplain’s advice on professional practice and support he offers every year to students studying anatomy involving dissection of cadavers. There was a sense that, in offering pastoral support at one end of the process, and overseeing memorial services for donated bodies at the other, the chaplain was introducing a welcome element of dignity and humanity into what might otherwise be a dispassionate, scientific process.

The relationship chaplains have with student support service departments also varies, with much depending on the extent to which the professionalisation of these services includes a hard distinction between student services and chaplaincy, and the extent to which relationships of trust have been built up to a point where genuine collaboration is possible. Including chaplains on committees – especially safeguarding, equality and diversity, or Prevent?72 - appears to be a common arrangement, with some institutional peculiarities alongside (e.g. the residual attachment to ecclesiastical ceremony at the traditional elite university reflected in the chaplain’s position on the ‘Graduation Working Group’). Some universities have located their chaplains within student support departments, chaplaincy accountable to a manager also responsible for counselling, mental health, student welfare or financial hardship support. Some chaplains recounted a lack of understanding between student support and chaplaincy, like the Anglican chaplain at the 1960s campus university, who attributes this to the institution’s secular ethos:

…they don’t really know what we do. But they’re getting better and they’re beginning to realise that actually we offer great listening services and pastoral care and that sort of thing. They’re not allowed to talk about religion really, so they need to be signposting us a bit more. I think the trouble is, also in amongst the academics, [this university] has been avowedly secular really from the word go. The diocese has provided chaplains; the [university] didn’t ask for them.

A narrative of improvement was also recounted by the Roman Catholic chaplain at the same institution, who spoke of an arrangement whereby chaplains could refer individual students to student support services, while also offering a place where vulnerable students could be referred by colleagues working in these services. However, when pressed on whether this functions as an ‘overflow’ service arrangement, the chaplain stressed the limited resources available, reflecting perhaps how the good intentions of chaplains and managers are often frustrated by limited time, resources and chaplains’ multiple other responsibilities.

At the Cathedrals Group university the arrangement appears more integrated. Chaplains there painted a picture of interdependence and collaboration that reflected an institutional culture in which chaplaincy is viewed as central. According to its Head of Theology, ‘the university involves the chaplaincy in everything’.73 While the 1960s campus chaplains experienced a relationship with student services that was functional but fairly minimal, the Cathedrals Group chaplains described an arrangement through which chaplains and student support work together to provide a more comprehensive welfare support structure for students. ‘Overflow’ appears an appropriate term, as chaplains are appealed to as a means to student welfare when professional services are under strain.

As the Roman Catholic chaplain commented:

With student services, I think there’s a very, very good relationship. I think the chaplaincy is seen by student services as another place that students can go to. Which is valued by student services, because their resources are always being trimmed. So chaplains can pick up some of the slack on that…Go to chaplaincy, have a cup of tea…They’re nice people. They’ll give you time.

A similar arrangement was described by the lead chaplain at the traditional elite university, who cited his role as a complementary source of support for especially vulnerable students:

72. The Prevent Duty refers to the obligations on public bodies to attend to the danger of individuals being drawn into terrorism, and is framed by specific government-led protocols. The responses of universities and chaplains’ involvement are discussed later in this chapter.

73. Indeed, this might partially explain the limited resources for non-Christian faiths noted earlier; if a Christian model of chaplaincy is so institutionally pervasive in Cathedrals Group universities, it may be especially difficult for non-Christian chaplains to achieve a functional presence within them.
…with certain students who have particular needs, often borderline personality disorder…that student may see me every two weeks and on the other every two weeks that student sees a counsellor in Student Services and we liaise and sometimes [the Deputy Director of Student Services] encourages the student to give permission to the two of us to share information, that’s happened about three times, four times maybe in six years. So there’s quite a lot of liaison on the pastoral care of students.

So an integrated model of pastoral support is possible outside of the Cathedrals Group, and university managers appeared especially receptive to drawing on the pastoral skills of chaplains when relationships of trust and familiarity had been built.

Several chaplains reported a positive relationship with their university’s Students Union. This appears to revolve in part around resources and available space, with SUs or affiliated student societies using chaplaincy buildings. When chaplains have resources to offer that are adaptable, conveniently located and freely available, they are – unsurprisingly – used by students needing meeting space. In the traditional elite university, chaplaincy rooms are available free to all student societies, but faith societies have priority. In some contexts, links with the SU are enhanced via well-established relationships, leading to a triage process that facilitates the referral of vulnerable students to appropriate services elsewhere in the university. As the red brick university Anglican chaplain recounted to us:

…there is…a welfare officer [and]… it’s a fantastic relationship because it means students that I see who actually kind of need some more professional help, counselling…or therapy or whatever, I can pass to her and students who aren’t really at that level but perhaps need someone friendly to have a cup of tea and a biscuit with, she can pass over to me, so that works quite well.

Again, the complementary relationship with professional services becomes apparent, with chaplains offering pastoral support for students who are vulnerable but whose needs do not necessarily reach the threshold of requiring professional medical or welfare assistance. At an informal level, this appears to be a crucial aspect of chaplaincy work valued by other university staff.

There was some evidence of deliberate and co-ordinated engagement with the SU, especially sabbatical officers, who were related to as both students whose role requires extra support and as fellow stakeholders in the process of supporting the university’s student body.74 The traditional elite Christian chaplain provides an instructive example:

I see the Sabbatical Officers, I invite them in here for coffee about twice a semester…there’s no agenda, they can get things off their chest. It gives them a chance to talk amongst each other about issues, without anybody dropping in. So they have an hour of uninterrupted…just sharing time, so I started that in about my second or third year here and every team of Sabbatical Officers, there are six of them now, they like it, really like it…

Faith societies were a major point of connection between chaplains and students across universities, especially for chaplains whose voluntary status meant their time was limited and they sought more focused engagement with students of their own faith tradition. One Roman Catholic assistant chaplain had re-established a CathSoc75 in order to foster community amongst Catholic students; a Sikh chaplain at the same institution gave talks to the Sikh Society as a way of supporting their work.

The role of lead or coordinating chaplain can offer an extra layer of support for faith societies that might not respond well to interventions from sabbatical officers, especially if the SU is viewed as unsympathetic to faith. The SU President at the traditional elite university recognised that,

[U]s trying to put some investment into getting them together or trying to organise them would be quite…I don’t know, I don’t want to say disrespectful, but it would be a bit odd if we were to say, ‘We’re non-religious, but we’re going to try and control the religious groups.’ So [the chaplain] provides that; I think we both work alongside each other and do our own things quite well.

The only cases we heard about of student-led faith societies not engaging positively with chaplains related to Christian Unions, borne out of theological tensions noted in earlier research (Ekklesia 2006; Guest et al 2013). This included an

74. Overall, our evidence suggests significant variation in chaplains’ relationships with their university’s Student’s Union. Our telephone interviews suggested the strongest relationships were within the Cathedrals Group, post-1992 and 1960s campus universities (p = < 0.1). Case study engagement also suggested qualitative differences possibly linked to institutional cultures, e.g. we had some difficulty getting the SU to help with our student survey at the red brick and 1960s campus universities – they refused and said it did not fit with their work – which may reflect a residual institutionalised secularism.

75. Catholic Society, run by students.
apparent boycott of inter-faith chaplaincy space and refusal to attend a carol service organised by the chaplaincy. The traditional elite lead chaplain described good relations with a range of societies – including Buddhist Meditation, CathSoc, Jewish Society, Islamic Society, and the Christian Union (CU) – but singled out the CU as potentially problematic, due to a periodic ‘hardening’ of their Christian perspective. This even becomes a focus of pastoral care, as ‘students come to me and talk me through the trauma of having been to these [CU] events.’ While this relational pattern – with chaplains offering pastoral care to those damaged by CU events – is evident elsewhere in the sector, it is worth noting that there were no signs of this in three of our five case studies.76

Orientations to Chaplaincy: Christian vs multi-faith

Chaplains were asked how chaplaincy at their university was understood, as primarily Christian or as multi-faith, and responses varied. For some chaplains, a distinction remains between how their chaplaincy services are ‘badged’ within their university – their ‘official’ status – and the way in which they function in practice, which may be quite different. For example, some say their chaplaincy is called ‘multi-faith’ (this is what appears ‘above the door’ and on the university website) but in practice really privileges the one or two faith traditions that represent the bulk of chaplains or of students who use the chaplaincy facilities. Others offer a more developed understanding of ‘inter-faith’ chaplaincy, which places greater emphasis on building relationships between faiths as integral to chaplaincy work.

Those who see their chaplaincy as distinctively ‘Christian’ do not view it as exclusively Christian; their vision for chaplaincy is either of Christian service to all staff and students, regardless of their faith or belief, or acknowledges a Christian bias indebted to the institutional and historical identity of their university while it remains committed to offering chaplaincy provision across a range of faith traditions. A Roman Catholic chaplain at the Cathedrals Group university described their institution’s model as ‘primarily Christian, even though we strive to be multi-faith’, while the Roman Catholic chaplain at the traditional elite university talked about chaplaincy there being ‘primarily Christian…although every effort is being made to have a representative of all faiths…’

The red brick university’s lead chaplain presented a vision of a distinctively Anglican programme of chapel activities set within a multi-faith chaplaincy, and while chaplaincy space has recently expanded into an adjacent reception hub, the space is very limited, which may reinforce the sense that Anglican identity is privileged over the ‘multi-faith’ aspect. As the lead chaplain comments:

It was my vision to explore the Anglican chaplaincy finding a home under a multi-faith chaplaincy banner…I think that…the chapel profile is therefore not something that has to be discussed and collaborated about in the same sort of way [that] a multi-faith meeting [does]… So we’re not wanting to have two chaplaincies. It is integrated, but the chapel is a Christian place of worship, which is sort of non-negotiable.

While this lead chaplain was keen to affirm an inclusive ethos – ‘it’s about being a multi-faith chaplaincy, but raising the profile of the chapel’ – the arrangement undeniably privileges an Anglican identity. Branding a building, department or service as ‘multi-faith’ was viewed by some managers as a little disingenuous when most of its resources are Christian and a Christian chapel has symbolic prominence on campus. Given the historically and materially more established status of Christian churches in the UK, especially Anglican and Roman Catholic, and their related embeddedness within university chaplaincy at a local level, this pattern is arguably to be expected within some – especially older – higher education contexts.

An even more ambiguous status was affirmed by staff at the 1960s campus university, including one who highlighted the challenge of according a distinctive ‘identity’ to chaplaincy when different measures point in different directions. A majority Christian staff can sit alongside a regular pattern of student engagement that is more visibly Muslim, especially when Friday prayers attract large numbers. But at this university a ‘multi-faith’ status for its chaplaincy was much more widely acknowledged and affirmed. However, as the Methodist chaplain commented, there are limits to the religious diversity it can claim: ‘you have to be honest, the students that use this centre, to my experience, are either Christian or Muslim. I haven’t seen any other faiths represented here.’
At the 1960s campus university, ‘multi-faith’ is tempered as a concept by the relative dominance of particular faith groups. In this sense, it is presented as an aspiration, viewed with subtle cynicism by some, often associated with institutional agendas beyond chaplaincy itself, but nevertheless embraced as a good thing by most. That said, it is a notion interpreted along differing lines, and in many references across our case study interviews, appears to be merely a short-hand for an aspirational ethos that affirms the needs of different faith groups. This may be accompanied by corresponding resources like prayer rooms, events budgets or part-time staff, but whether any of these flow into specifically non-Christian chaplaincy varies. ‘Multi-faith’ could amount to a multiplication of faith resources (so Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs have budgets and buildings as well as the Christians), but more commonly it is expressed in multi-purpose facilities, overseen and led by coordinating chaplains who are predominantly Christian.77 A more integrated model was affirmed within the post-1992 university, at which the lead chaplain promoted a model of inter- (rather than multi-) faith chaplaincy, which had inter-faith conversation and collaboration at its heart. While most chaplains appear to affirm the value of this in principle, few seem to have the time, energy or opportunity to make this a core part of their work. Inter-faith opportunities are always constrained by levels of religious diversity on campus and in the local area, and to be fair, this is not a vocational priority for many chaplains. At the post-1992 university, the lead chaplain’s approach benefited from synergies with the local community – which included Muslims and Sikhs – and the culturally and religiously diverse student body, so that a vision for an inclusive chaplaincy cohered with an ethos shared by the whole university.

By contrast, the articulation of a distinctively Christian model of chaplaincy was prevalent among chaplains and managers at the Cathedrals Group case study, reflecting how their vision is integrated into a shared sense of identity. As described by one chaplain:

It’s a Christian chaplaincy, we’re very clear about that. That statement doesn’t have any impact on who we support or how we support them, which I think is a very brave line…If we were to pretend to be something different it would be false, it’s a Christian university, you don’t have to be a Christian to come to the university, but your services will be Christian services, it’s the university that they have chosen to come to. It’s a Christian chaplaincy…we don’t pray, we don’t compromise the safe space that we’re trying to create…

Alongside an organisationally integrated and embedded vision for chaplaincy that reflects the institution’s Christian identity, non-Christian faith support is offered via a series of ‘advisors’ based in the surrounding locale. In this sense, faith support (‘chaplaincy’ is upheld, at least by the university’s Vice Chancellor, as a distinctively Christian concept), is structured around a two-tier system that is intended to support non-Christian students via tradition-specific links in the local community, while also preserving the ethos of the university as quintessentially and unapologetically Christian. That being said, it is unclear as to how integrated or well-resourced such non-Christian ‘faith-support’ actually is at this institution. While there are some hints of a more religiously pluralist awareness on campus, non-Christian ‘advisors’ are not mentioned on its website, non-Christian prayer space was very limited, and one chaplain stressed the lack of a Jewish and Muslim presence: ‘As for other religions and religious groups - doesn’t really exist. So there’s no JSoc. There’s no ISoc. There’s no Muslim chaplain…So it’s very much a Christian chaplaincy.’

In other universities, an inherited Christian hegemony sits slightly awkwardly alongside an institutional drive to foster a more inclusive vision. The Buddhist chaplain at the traditional-elite university acknowledged a predominance of Christian chaplaincy but justified this in terms of the ‘predominantly Christian community that it’s serving’, adding that the presence of a range of voluntary chaplains from other traditions reflected something of a ‘multi-faith ethos’. However, it is not clear whether this impression of a ‘predominantly Christian community’ reflects a prevalence of Christian faith amongst students or cultural residues that owe more to local culture and the history of the university. Comments from staff suggest more the latter, although there is evidence to suggest this is valued by some, including non-religious individuals who warm to the related sense of tradition and shared identity.

---

77. There is arguably a common assumption on the part of managers that assuming this responsibility is a straightforward request. This might be questioned on a number of grounds, not least personal and professional resources; we explore what this might mean for the integrity of the individual in Chapter 6.
Institutional accommodation of chaplaincy

As is plain from the discussion above, chaplains enjoy varied relationships with their universities, relationships shaped by institutional ethos, the changing priorities of university leadership, a shared memory of what happened in the past, shifting personnel, and complex relationships to religious organisations, among other factors. Given the long-term secularisation of the higher education sector (Aune and Stevenson 2017; Bebbington 1992; Guest et al. 2013), we might expect chaplains to feel marginalised and under-resourced. While there is some truth in this, institutional orientations to chaplaincy are complex, with some evidence of chaplaincy achieving new relevance in some institutions.

We asked our case study interviewees whether they thought their universities were friendly, neutral or hostile to faith, and then asked them the same question about chaplaincy. The ‘hostility’ option didn’t carry unqualified resonance for any of them on either count. Some recalled a time when this was not the case, and there was some recognition of a residual suspicion, especially within newer universities established as ‘self-consciously secular’. But there was also in these institutions an acknowledgement that universities had become more accommodating of faith, not least because of the renewed urgency of recruiting international students in a market-driven sector, but also as new leadership has embraced a more inclusive agenda. In some cases this was experienced as a complete turn-around, as the 1960s campus Methodist chaplain reflected:

I think in the past certainly some of my colleagues would have said that this university is hostile. It was very much a secular university. If people wanted to exercise their right to worship, well that was fine, but they could do it in their own time, in their own way. I think that’s changed and I would certainly move to neutral if not a bit more affirmative than that. I’ve been very struck by the interest that’s been shown in us and the work here, and the way in which the university want to actually promote it. I think that’s very good.

In several cases there were reports of renewed investment in chaplaincy work, including refurbishment of spaces and provision of new ones. Parallel to this – especially in the 1960s campus and post-1992 universities – was a new recognition of chaplaincy as a valuable asset, particularly in responding to students who are in crisis or feeling marginalised.

Accommodation to matters of faith in general and of chaplaincy in particular takes different forms, including a distinction between the ‘hard’ resource of money, space and facilities and the more ‘soft’ or relational support experienced via collegiality and consultation within broader processes of governance and student support. Past experiences of being marginalised mean many chaplains place great store in simple acts of inclusion: being invited to receptions with senior managers, having counsellor colleagues refer students to them for support, and being granted access to university spaces rather than having to seek permission. The traditional elite chaplaincy was affirmed through its location within the institution’s organisational structure, which reflected the lead chaplain’s experience of having his work supported and recognised by senior managers:

I think [the university’s support is] manifested partly through…being a really great line manager to me. I think it’s manifested through the fact that chaplaincy is a stand-alone unit in the university, we’re not subsumed into say Student Services. There are other chaplains that I meet at conferences who talk about how difficult it can be to be part of a secular unit when there’s an agenda that’s antithetical to chaplaincy driving that. I think it’s there through budgeting, so we have had an increase in our resource of secretaries from roughly 0.8 to about 1.6, a doubling of secretarial provision over my [time] here. I think it’s manifested through the fact that every graduation day begins with a chapel service…It’s quite a public face. I think it’s manifested through the fact that when a student dies it’s my role to be the key liaison between the family and the university, unless the family explicitly say they don’t want chaplaincy involved.

In this context, wider institutional support is viewed as benign and reflective of a sincere appreciation of chaplaincy work. In other contexts such support is viewed as motivated by different agendas, and some chaplains tempered their positive perspective on their institution because compliance with formal obligations was not necessarily backed up with more substantial commitment to chaplaincy work. As the post-1992 university’s Roman Catholic assistant chaplain put it,

I’d say they’re fairly neutral…I mean they’ve been accommodating…to faith, to different faith groups, you know, in [what]…they’ve provided for… students…for the new prayer facilities and washing facilities…at the inter-faith centre but I mean they haven’t gone out of their way, I feel that probably they feel that’s kind of an obligation rather than this is something that they’d like to do, so I wouldn’t say they’re friendly in that sense…I often get the feeling that…chaplaincy’s something they’ve got to kind of do to tick a box somewhere.
‘They’ here appears to refer to university management, highlighting a common experience whereby chaplains feel subject to decisions beyond their control. If a distant or disinterested management is also viewed as pursuing an agenda dissonant with chaplains’ own approach to their work – placing income generation or regulatory compliance above student welfare, for example – then this sense of alienation is heightened. Others simply cite responses from university colleagues that lack dependability or understanding. As the Anglican lead chaplain at the red brick university put it: ‘There is friendliness. Sometimes it feels there is a little bit of hostility through...lack of understanding and wanting to reduce impact. So I think it neutralises [the friendliness].’

The most effusive and widely affirmed sense of institutional friendliness to faith and chaplaincy was found, unsurprisingly, in the Cathedrals Group university. As its Methodist chaplain stated: ‘I think its base and its ethos is a Christian ethos, so it is friendly to faith definitely.’ This general sense of a culture of support was reinforced, as with the traditional elite university, by maintaining a prominently positioned chapel, and permitting chaplaincy work to include roles that impact on a wide range of staff and students. But while the traditional elite university channelled this arrangement almost entirely through its lead chaplain (the only chaplain paid by the university), in the Cathedrals Group university, there were several paid Christian chaplains, including some whose professional role combined chaplaincy with other duties, hence further embedding a chaplaincy presence within different segments of campus life.

Overall, patterns of accommodation appear to relate to university type, as illustrated within our five case studies. Traditional elite and Cathedrals Group universities reflected an arrangement in which chaplaincy has an integral role, and perspectives among chaplains and their professional colleagues suggested faith support was both a welcome strength and part of a shared organisational culture. This was more often translated into a coherent institutional ethos within the Cathedrals Group university, as affirmed by a number of staff interviewees. The traditional elite university owed its elevation of faith support more to an embedded historical link to Christian churches and the entrepreneurial efforts of the lead chaplain, including building relationships across university departments. In both institutions a strong and well-resourced chaplaincy was long established and valued. By contrast, the red brick, 1960s campus and post-1992 universities exhibited more ambivalent orientations to chaplaincy. They also reported more recent organisational change and instability, which feed into a sense that faith support retains an uncertain status. These universities have enjoyed mixed relationships with religious organisations in the recent past and/or have prioritised a more utilitarian orientation to higher education that has included limiting resources not directly linked to teaching and research.

Chaplains in these institutions were, correspondingly, more likely to cite a professional experience of vulnerability and uncertainty. For most, though, such experiences appear to be largely a thing of the past.

Institutional variations in the organisation, support and management of chaplaincy

All of the chaplains we interviewed were oriented towards supporting students’ spiritual lives and journeys through university, through various formalised and informal mechanisms, and with a few looking beyond students to staff and the wider university and local community. Yet the chaplaincy teams in our five case studies were structured quite differently, reflecting in part the differences between types of university described in Chapter 1, including internal structure, systems of management and forms of governance. However, chaplains in the same university sometimes gave conflicting information about the structure of the team and its management, seeming to inflate or reduce certain people’s roles. This means that, perhaps unlike roles in other parts of the university, the chaplaincy’s roles and structure are contested and negotiated rather than fixed and set within a clear and straightforward hierarchy.

Given their sometimes divergent values, the relationship between chaplains and wider university management is not always straightforward, and yet chaplains are often embedded within university management structures. When asked ‘How satisfied are you with the support you receive from university managers?’, almost 67% of chaplains are either satisfied or very satisfied. Interestingly, university type makes no statistically significant difference to the answers chaplains offer to this question, and neither does religious identity. Gender appears marginally more influential as a

---

78. We found some interesting differences in theological approach, which are addressed in Chapter 2.

79. There are too few respondents from non-Christian religions to test whether alignment with any particular tradition influences patterns of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, but collapsing respondents into Christian and non-Christian and cross-tabulating these with levels of satisfaction suggests there is no significant relationship.
factor, and so there may be value in examining why female chaplains might be less satisfied in the support they receive than male chaplains, but this difference is not major, and may be viewed as statistically insignificant. So, notwithstanding this issue with male and female experiences, chaplains based at all university types and regardless of religious tradition are equally likely to be satisfied or dissatisfied with the support they receive from their managers. Nevertheless, our case studies reflect varied patterns of collaboration and accountability, suggesting important qualitative differences in the ways chaplains are integrated into university structures. We explore these below, drawing on interviews with chaplains and the university managers they work with.

The traditional elite university

The traditional elite university has one Christian chaplain, who is seen as the key chaplain and is responsible for managing chapel activities (for instance employing the organists) and recruiting new chaplains. This chaplain reports to a very senior and supportive member of university management, and appears to be liked and respected throughout and beyond the university. The university structures its chaplaincy provision around this lead Christian chaplain (who is employed and provided with a house by the university), and a number of voluntary chaplains. It appears that the members of this latter group change from time to time, representing most world religions, quite a few Christian denominations and humanism. The team also has two administrators, partly because the chapel hosts many weddings. The lead chaplain meets the Roman Catholic chaplain (who is one of the voluntary team) once a week, and a meeting of the entire team takes place regularly but less often. The university pays all chaplains’ travel expenses.

The lead Christian chaplain explained the structure clearly, describing the other chaplains as ‘responsible to me’, and the team also provided a support structure for him, but the other chaplains had a less clear understanding of this. As is the case in many universities, the voluntary chaplains have multiple other responsibilities – and usually full-time paid jobs – and so the time they have to give to chaplaincy work is limited. Correspondingly, contact between university managers and the volunteer chaplains is also limited, and mainly consists of pre-appointment training delivered by the Director of Student Services or Head of Counselling, particularly about university policies on confidentiality and how to report students who are a risk to themselves or others. Most other contact is via the lead chaplain, who provides induction and acts as a conduit for concerns about student welfare and faith support. The lead chaplain works closely with student services but is located within his own organisational unit within the university. This arrangement was put in place prior to the present chaplain’s appointment; his predecessor had sat within Student Services but it was felt issues of confidentiality had become problematic (staff within Student Services are expected to share information about students with professional colleagues, whereas the chaplain might not always feel able to do this). The lead chaplain meets monthly with the Director of Student Services to discuss students who are a cause for concern, and also attends the monthly Student Services Directors’ Meeting alongside the Head of Counselling, Head of Disability and others. Student Services contact him whenever a student is admitted to hospital and he pays them a pastoral visit, and student deaths are handled jointly by the Director of Student Services and the lead chaplain.

The Director of Student Services also acknowledged the university has limited resources for student support, and that the lead chaplain’s capacity to absorb some of the counselling responsibilities helps a great deal. This appears to function within an informal arrangement of mutual cross-referral, with the chaplain viewed as especially useful in handling students who may require less formal support or guidance with faith-related issues.

The lead chaplain also sits on the Senior Directors Group, alongside all other heads of major departments in the university, and so is in a position to contribute to the governance and strategy of the institution. He has monthly ‘catch up’ meetings with the Pro-Vice Chancellor for Teaching and Learning81 (his line manager), although she says this largely involves him keeping her informed, rather than referring problems to her. The trust built up between them has led to a fairly hands-off management arrangement, with responsibilities of a pastoral kind very much devolved to the lead chaplain to attend to as he sees fit. If he would like to facilitate an event or relationship with another organisation, a system is used that involves managerial consultation but appears to be liked and respected throughout and beyond the university. The university structures its chaplaincy function within an informal arrangement of mutual cross-referral, with the chaplain viewed as especially useful in handling students who may require less formal support or guidance with faith-related issues.

80. Among female chaplains, 66.9% are satisfied or very satisfied, while 15.4% are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. The figures are 73.2% and 13.1% for male chaplains. (p< 0.13)

81. This individual’s title has been changed to something more generic to preserve the institution’s anonymity.
I mean [the chaplain’s] the boss and he just gets on with what he wants to do. So he might bring to me a query of diplomacy or politics or if he wants to talk through something that he’s been having a bit of a difficult time with. Which is rare but it happens sometimes. You know, one of the administrative staff not looking happy in their job or that kind of thing. But really on the whole he just gets on with it...we don’t have a hugely hierarchical structure here. And if something urgent came up and what we really needed was for [the chaplain] and me to sit down with [the vice chancellor] and say we’ve got a problem, then that’s what we would do. And we’d be able to do it very quickly really.

All of the managers we spoke to at the traditional elite university were both highly impressed and deeply appreciative of the lead chaplain’s work, whose success appeared to rest on a great energy for activity and involvement, a gregarious disposition, and a willingness to build relationships across a wide range of university departments, what his line manager called a ‘broad citizenship’. The work of the voluntary chaplains was less visible to managers, who had little contact with them, and who were concerned that their work as volunteers remain fully accountable as representatives of the university. There is no memorandum of understanding as volunteers remain fully accountable as representatives of the university. There is no memorandum of understanding between the voluntary chaplains and the university, as there is a recognition of a need to allow some freedom for chaplains to operate in accordance with the distinct needs of their traditions. Rather, oversight is put in place via a nomination process initiated by the lead chaplain and signed off by senior management, and appointments are for three years subject to renewal. This structure and management is viewed as working well by the voluntary chaplains, although the lead chaplain also drew attention to the challenges that arise from managing a diverse group of volunteers from outside the university:

…what you have is essentially people who are professionals within their own area, and …they have authority very often within their own religion, and then they become appointed as…chaplains and their authority is derived from their authority in their own place, but actually they are under my management and within the university setting…What you get sometimes is people who act in a certain way because that’s perfectly in accordance with their own denomination or religion. But the university has different, more secular, more boundaries, more cautious expectations, and that has proved really difficult to manage of late in one or two cases.

The red brick university

At the red brick university chaplaincy arrangements are complicated by the existence of a trust that funds the lead chaplain and has a long-standing relationship with the university. While this post is, due to the trust’s identity and requirements, occupied by an ordained Anglican, the chaplain also serves as coordinator of the multi-faith chaplaincy team. The trust handles its relationship with the university through an Anglican chaplaincy management group. The university provides on-campus space for chaplains (although this is acknowledged to be less than ideal) and funds an administrator to assist chaplains who is line managed by the lead Anglican chaplain. In addition, a second Anglican chaplain - paid for by the Church of England – has within their role a ministry to a second campus, alongside maintaining a worshipping community within its chapel.

While the lead Anglican chaplain has ‘associate staff’ status with respect to the university, the other chaplains (except the second part-time Anglican) are all volunteers. The team is large, with 15-20 chaplains, representing a wide range of faith groups, all of whom are invited to a fortnightly meeting. These volunteer chaplains are line-managed by the lead Anglican chaplain, but nominated by a local religious figure who represents their faith community; these local leaders are all invited to a biannual meeting with the university as a means of maintaining links with local faith communities. Like in the traditional elite university, dependence on volunteer chaplains has raised issues of accountability, with the university management keen to ensure all chaplains follow centrally issued guidelines while also clarifying their independence from the university. As one manager put it, ‘I worry about them as a previously uncontrolled group dealing with students. I’m particularly worried about students here, who are in a vulnerable state.’

Recent changes have sought to respond to these issues and to clarify lines of accountability and responsibility, including making the Head of Wellbeing line manger to chaplaincy. The university has also requested that the lead Anglican chaplain take a more directive role with respect to their management of the wider chaplaincy team, and this has been met with some resistance. As the lead chaplain describes it:

There was quite a lot of reaction to what had been set up by an Anglican foundation and the university talking with each other, but not including [the other chaplains] as part of the decision-making process. So…there’s been a little bit of discontent and [the] university has had to reconsider...how that can be better managed.
And whether it’s appropriate to use ‘lead’, and to really listen to what the chaplains have got to say. Some of them have been chaplains for ten years, and so there’s a lot of history.

Management style appears to be a key point of contention (including a perception of symbolic alignment with ‘management’ over ‘chaplaincy’), as well as the tricky business of managing a diverse team, many of whom are volunteers and so give their time freely. One chaplain reflected pointedly on what he saw as the key question for the team: ‘are we being coordinated or are we being managed?’ Some referred to a valued independence from the university that had been lost. One university manager attributes this discontent to a combination of a previously low-key arrangement becoming more formalised and experienced as heavy handed, and a sense that this amounts to an Anglican imposition over what is self-consciously understood to be a ‘multi-faith’ chaplaincy. In response to this discontent, the university is in the process of reviewing the line management structure that applies to chaplaincy, with systems of responsibility and accountability clarified in a series of newly drafted documents.

Insofar as it relates to the broader structures of the university, much of the chaplains’ work is caught up in issues of pastoral support and inclusivity. The chaplaincy has a representative on the university’s Inclusivity Group, and, according to the Chief Operating Officer, this presents a synergy with the chaplains’ sense of pastoral responsibility: ‘It’s quite interesting involving the chaplaincy…in some of our discussions around inclusivity because…their entire approach is around inclusivity’. The same manager voices some concerns about the recent integration of chaplaincy further into the management structures of the university, wishing to retain a capacity for ‘creativity and freedom’ and not ‘being seen as part of the management machine’. So multiple voices are identifiable among managers, as well as chaplains.

Chaplains have also been involved in the Prevent Implementation Group, the Chief Operating Officer saying they ‘had one of the…strongest and loudest voices’ and ‘were absolutely key in helping us deliver a…measured, sensitive approach.’ He acknowledged the university hadn’t got this exactly right, but suggested chaplains’ influence had been instrumental in ensuring Prevent wasn’t lazily assumed to apply primarily to faith communities (something backed up by his awareness of the local area, which would suggest a more likely terrorist threat would come from far right or animal rights groups). The current Prevent compliance system is described by this manager as ‘very light touch’, dependent on staff booking external speakers performing simple checks online in case anything suspect flags up. This he sees as the right level of scrutiny, avoiding alienating staff, and credits chaplains with informing the level of sensitivity built into the system.

The Head of Wellbeing echoes this appreciation of chaplaincy, especially insofar as chaplains have worked so constructively with professional student support services, so that a habit of mutual cross-referral of students who are struggling has become an operational convention. They see even more potential for integrated provision of student support, while also recognising a misperception shared by some staff that chaplains only serve the needs of those with faith. This manager disagrees with this view, and wants to affirm the broader value of chaplaincy work, emphasising their capacity to provide a ‘network of support’:

I think there’s still a misperception amongst staff as much as students that chaplaincy is for people of faith. I don’t think it is just for that. But I do see that what they provide is probably in essence potentially more important than what we provide in terms of ongoing support because we will provide a professionalised, one off session, assessment mental health plan…but actually what a lot of students need who are unwell is a network of support, a friendly community, of people who are just there, non-judgemental and supportive, and I think chaplaincy does try to do that here quite well.

The 1960s campus university

At the 1960s campus university, a recent internal review of chaplaincy had sought to clarify lines of accountability within the university. The resulting arrangement makes chaplaincy accountable to the Student Wellbeing and Inclusivity Service, specifically to a senior manager in that division, although this relationship is viewed less in terms of management and more in terms of facilitation (including some administrative support and a resources budget) and information sharing. This rather nuanced arrangement arises out of the fact that none of the chaplains are paid by the university; as the Disability Support Manager put it, ‘We don’t line manage the chaplains, we support and coordinate and offer information and advice and guide… to all intents and purposes they are volunteers from a university perspective.’ The chaplaincy team is smaller than at the red brick, and challenges were acknowledged by the Methodist chaplain, who highlighted the limited time most of them have to contribute: ‘It makes it very difficult to arrange a programme where we’re all involved together.’ Difficulties had also arisen because of university expectations that often
exceeded what is practically possible, such as ensuring chaplains are available between certain hours of the day.

Another difference from the red brick university is that, other than one Buddhist, all the chaplains are Christians. This is, they explained, not for want of trying. The university wanted to pay a Muslim chaplain, but the student Islamic Society rejected the person lined up for this role. The university’s location, a few miles from a modest-sized city where the non-Christian religious groups are small with an older membership, had made finding suitable non-Christian chaplains a challenge.

The chaplains together form a chaplaincy committee, whose chair is paid a small stipend for their work supporting the wider group of chaplains, who also elect this chair from among their own number. So far the role has been taken by the Anglican and the Catholic chaplains, even though the Anglican is often mistaken for the lead as the only full-time chaplain.

On a termly basis, the chaplains meet with the academic registrar, who responds to concerns and advises on appropriate lines of guidance and collaboration within the broader university. The academic registrar sees this as a means of more closely integrating chaplains into the university:

I think they probably can feel a little bit on the outside. They don’t really know who is the best person to talk to about something. So, I think that’s the role that I’ve played, but also by integrating it in to what we’re doing and seeing is…an important part of a service that we offer to students. I hope they feel supported in that.

The academic registrar emphasises the importance of chaplaincy being integrated into the broader range of services offered by the university; at the same time, they see chaplains as primarily there to support people of faith. In this sense chaplaincy is viewed as important but only alongside other student services, distinguishable by the constituency it serves rather than the distinct service it provides. The academic registrar made this point strongly, while also stressing the need for chaplaincy not to exceed its place within campus life. In response to a question about what makes chaplaincy effective, they commented:

I think it’s ensuring that people of faith who require access to chaplaincy have it at the right time. It’s part of the broader range of services that we offer is what I’d say, and making sure it’s accessible and included but it’s also not seen as something that people have to do…I’ve been to university where you arrive and there’s a church in the middle of the campus…but then there’s a question about…people who aren’t religious… I love churches but that’s just a personal thing. But you see the point I’m making. It’s making sure it’s accessible and visible but not in a way that makes people feel uncomfortable.

Chaplaincy at the 1960s campus university is badged as ‘multi-faith’, although as one manager points out, most of the chaplains are Christian and most of those who attend chaplaincy festivities are Muslims. In this sense the institution reflects a not uncommon pattern in UK higher education, of affirming religiously pluralist provision while in practice this is subject to majority dominance by one or two traditions. In this case, the multi-faith aspect appears to reflect the determination of university management to adhere to what they see as indicating an inclusive ethos in spite of the practical realities of faith provision on the ground.

In some areas of university life, chaplaincy appears well integrated. For example, the Prevent Duty is implemented as a safeguarding issue, with a chaplain serving on the relevant committee to ensure, according to one manager, that ‘all the voices are around the table’. The aim of this group is to highlight ‘that things are happening, but also that it’s being done in a way that is inclusive and not seeming to target particular groups.’ At the same time, there is a perception among some managers that chaplaincy is lagging behind some of the university’s other professional services. As one manager put it,

We’re a lot more robust in terms of processes, procedures, health and safety, safeguarding, Prevent training. A lot more robust in those areas than we perhaps were previously. But I think there is still quite a way to go to just raise a profile of the chaplaincy across the university and embed it a little bit more.

_Interviewer: What would be the advantages of embedding it?_

Perhaps to make it more of a go-to place but not just for students with particular religions, but for students with no religion, and that is how we identify the chaplaincy at the moment. It’s people with religion or people with no religion. At the moment, it’s used primarily by people with specific religious denominations but it could also be a quiet reflective space that students go back to.

Unlike the academic registrar, this manager views chaplaincy as potentially serving a much wider constituency than those
students who are identifiably ‘of faith’. For her, ‘embedding’ chaplaincy is not just about aligning it more closely with the university’s management structures, but about re-imagining chaplaincy as serving the institution in broader terms, expanding its relevance as a service. She goes on to outline her hope that chaplaincy might also expand its work to include a ‘listening ear’ to complement professional counselling services, ‘just for people who perhaps want to have a chat with somebody but don’t want to go through anything more formal at that point.’ This manager had only had chaplaincy within her professional remit for a few weeks when we interviewed her, so it is interesting that her vision for the delivery of chaplaincy services is institution-wide rather than faith-defined. What we have encountered in other contexts as emerging – apparently quite naturally – from the parish mentality of Anglicanism, is here being generated from a professional student services perspective. The first assumes a geographically defined pastoral remit for chaplains, the second seeks to draw chaplains into the same kind of approach, but along the lines of supplemental assistance to existing, ‘secular’ provision. In stark contrast to the academic registrar, this manager accords relevance to chaplaincy well beyond tradition-based faith support. According to one of the Students Union officers, there is significant demand from students seeking counsel with a chaplain every year, leading to an informal referral system between the SU and the chaplaincy team. So this manager may be responding to an existing trend emerging among the students themselves.

At the 1960s campus university, management have a rather ambiguous relationship with its chaplains: on the one hand, they are volunteers whose independence is undeniable, something valued by the Roman Catholic chaplain, who commented that the current arrangement works well,

…because it allows us to have the links with people in the university who can help us, support us, but yet it allows us to have autonomy to do what we think is best in our own way. The other value of it is that because we’re not directly managed…we can be…a voice to say what you think…which is harder to say to your manager.

On the other hand the university is keen to embed chaplaincy within its core aims and organisational structures (although managers differ over what this means – see above). This is clearly a tricky balance to strike, as the university has an increasing stake in chaplaincy provision – e.g. as student numbers grow more Muslims wish to attend on-campus Friday prayers, but space is limited – and yet it invests very little financially in chaplaincy, by far the least of our five case studies in fact. It is possible that the university’s secular foundation is holding it back in this respect, although interviews with managers indicate changing perspectives about what chaplains could, potentially, bring to campus life that is of value to the university’s students.

The post-1992 university

Chaplaincy arrangements at the post-1992 university resemble its traditional elite counterpart insofar as they revolve around an energetic, gregarious (Anglican) lead chaplain supported by a wider team of volunteer chaplains representing other traditions. In both institutions chaplaincy has been granted its own dedicated building and in both cases the lead chaplain’s hard work building relationships with staff across the university has earned them recognition as a legitimate and valued contributor to the life of the institution. One major difference relates to the institutional identities that frame this situation. The traditional elite university has a long history of connections to the Christian church, a highly esteemed theology department and, while not now viewing itself as a Christian institution, nevertheless retains ceremonial traditions that have an ecclesiastical flavour. Consequently, we might not be surprised to find that chaplaincy - at least in its Christian expression – sits comfortably within this context. By contrast, this university traces its origins to a technical college founded in the early twentieth century which gained university status in 1992. Its strengths are in applied courses that have a vocational orientation and many of its students are from the local area. Its culture as an institution is utilitarian and functional, focused on the delivery of courses and support of students, and it is with respect to the latter than the current chaplain has secured a role of enduring relevance.

The university underwent a re-structuring of its student support services in 2016, at which point chaplaincy was integrated into the ‘Student Wellbeing’ section alongside counselling, health and wellbeing. As the senior manager who devised this arrangement told us:

…my purpose behind doing that was to mainstream chaplaincy, particularly in terms of its focus on spiritual well-being, wellness, mindfulness and mental, positive mental health. Mainstream that within a wellbeing offer. So in management terms, the chaplain now reports on a daily basis [to the] Head of Wellbeing.

There are echoes here of the aspirations shared by the 1960s campus university manager who was keen to ‘embed’ chaplaincy into a broader system of student support. A major difference though, is that chaplaincy at the post-1992 university receives much more investment from the centre
and from the local Anglican diocese (funding 80% of the lead chaplain’s post). This, along with the energy and social skills of the chaplain currently holding that position, mean a broad vision for the purpose of chaplaincy is both meaningful to its key stake holders, and sustainable as a valued resource.

The university has Anglican, Roman Catholic, Jewish, Buddhist, Sikh and Muslim chaplains. The Anglican chaplain, who prioritises inter-faith work, had developed this team, reducing the number of different Christian denominations represented: ‘all I have done is perhaps condensed some of the Christian denominational stuff, keen to have people who we can refer to if people want to but the chaplaincy team being dominated by Christian denominations was not always the best way.’

The lead chaplain reports to the Head of Wellbeing, and sits on the University Faith Group, chaired by a senior manager in student support, which meets once a term. The other, ‘associate’ chaplains are managed by the lead chaplain, meet once each term and sign an agreement with the university that clarifies their commitments and responsibilities. They are all volunteers with the exception of the Muslim chaplain, who at the time of our research had just been contracted on a part-time but ongoing basis, paid by the university in recognition of his increasingly expansive role serving the university’s Muslim community. This move coincides with the recent establishment of a dedicated, and considerable, university space repurposed for Muslim prayers as well as Muslim chaplaincy services more broadly.82 The university’s investment in dedicated space extends to its Inter-faith Chaplaincy Centre, which includes the chaplain’s office, a library, prayer facilities, and a number of meeting rooms used by faith and non-faith groups, from within and outside the university. Chaplaincy also receives a non-staff budget for materials and events, which one manager describes as only ‘a small amount, but it’s very much in line with…what we are able to give the other support services’, reflecting a recognition of chaplaincy as of equal value to non-faith-based student support. There is every sign that chaplaincy is valued and viewed as integral to the support structures of the university.

Far from simply sitting within ‘Wellbeing’ as an organisational convenience, the university chaplain is viewed as a highly integrated member of a broader student support team, helping with training events, attending team meetings, and contributing to the pastoral support of staff. He also works from an office within the Wellbeing section two mornings a week, and so has a visible presence within the team. At the same time, chaplaincy is viewed as distinctive, offering something complementary and valuable in its own right; one non-religious manager highlighted the way it engages with the existential concerns that preoccupy many of those students seeking support.

The lead chaplain also sits on the Equality Diversity and Community Committee and works with HR on diversity issues. As with the traditional elite lead chaplain, university management very much associate chaplaincy services with this individual (although associate chaplains do seem slightly more embedded at this post-1992 university). More informally, the chaplain has built a strong relationship with the Students Union and has served as a link between the SU and university at a time when relations had been strained. His capacity to build relationships is also evident in the local community, facilitated in part by the chaplain’s Anglican networks but also work with social justice causes in the area. The chair of the Equality, Diversity and Community Committee suggests this benefits the university because of its ethos in serving the local community, but also reflects how rooted students and staff are in that region:

We don’t try and operate in isolation. We’re very aware that our staff and students are part of a wider community and we’re very keen to reach out to that wider community. So we had, for example, volunteering events where both staff and students have got involved with all kinds of city wide groups and forums…So, the chaplain is very well connected and very well placed to both represent the university but also bring the university out to the wider city as well.

This perception is shared amongst the managers we spoke to, and the chaplain’s breadth of engagement (including inter-faith relations and reaching out to minority groups like the student LGBT society), appears to have modelled an inclusivity that impresses them as an embodiment of the values they also wish to uphold. One manager affirmed this directly: ‘I think we have been a much more open and accepting university because our chaplain has brought that wider community and has taught tolerance and respect…’ As an institutional culture, this is also reflected in the university’s handling of Prevent, which has been embedded

82. In these respects, this university appears to have developed provision in keeping with Siddiqui’s (2007) recommendations for the HE sector more generally, not least in contributing funding to pay the Muslim chaplain, who is also an imam who can lead Friday prayers and who works well with the university.
in safeguarding processes and is viewed, according to one manager, as ‘another strand of protecting and supporting our student body’. A Safeguarding and Prevent Group deals with strategic issues, while a different Faith Facilities Group - including both the university chaplain and the Muslim chaplain - has served as a means of overseeing faith facilities like prayer rooms and as a channel for reporting and addressing any incidents that have raised concerns. The one incident shared with us related to a member of the local Muslim community who had been openly critical about the Muslim chaplain’s leadership; while external individuals are welcome to use the facilities if accompanied by a member of the university, this person was subsequently written to and asked not to return. So a degree of monitoring is in place, and this is viewed in a broader context of local community relations, staff mindful of the popularity of the far right in the local area. At the same time, the lead chaplain has strategically used the Prevent Duty as leverage in securing university funding for the Muslim chaplain, whose work was widely recognised in building bridges between the university and the wider Muslim community.

The post-1992 university presents a fascinating case study of how chaplaincy has secured an enduring and pervasive sense of relevance across an ostensibly secular institution. As with the traditional elite university, this is partly due to the personal qualities of the Anglican clergyman who occupies the post. But it is also a function of how the structures of the organisation have integrated chaplaincy, and how the success of this arrangement has shaped the perspectives of managers who oversee it. The emerging vision is not just ‘friendly’ to faith, but affirms chaplaincy as offering something unique to the life of the university. As one senior manager put it, ‘in my view, chaplaincy here has become a real force for good. Greater than the sum of its parts...chaplaincy has a tremendous contribution to make around the big objective we have around increasing student[s’] sense of belonging.’

The Cathedrals Group university

Unsurprisingly, chaplaincy within the Cathedrals Group university is much more integrated into the broader management of the institution than at any of our other case studies, both in terms of personnel but also distribution of chaplaincy-type responsibilities. Maintaining an institution established as a Christian foundation with a Christian ethos, the university’s senior management understands chaplaincy - at least in its ecumenical Christian form – to be central to the life of the university and a key mechanism for upholding its distinctive character.

All chaplains sit, alongside senior management, the chair of governors and chair of council, on the university’s Mission and Values Group, which is chaired by the Vice Chancellor. So chaplaincy has a seat at one of the most senior committees, alongside those directly responsible for running the university. Anglican, Catholic and Free Church chaplains are paid as full-time members of staff by the university, while chaplains representing other denominations or faiths work on a voluntary basis and are appointed via local faith communities. In addition, three members of academic staff who are ordained Christian ministers are also accorded a pastoral role, manage the work of the chaplaincy and sit on the Mission and Values Group. Two of the paid chaplains also occupy other roles in the university, so that they are contracted for a portion of their job to do chaplaincy, and in the other part one works in counselling and one in student events management. In this respect the staff structures ensure chaplaincy, academic departments and student support are more closely integrated than at any of our other case studies. Chaplains are highly active in the university and engage with its work multi-laterally; as one manager put it ‘chaplaincy sort of permeates everything really here.’

Central to the chaplains’ role is student support and, in this respect, as in many others, they occupy a rather liminal position with respect to management. They have a formal role in offering pastoral care, but also function more informally in facilitating cross-referrals to other student services and serving the general culture of the institution, including pastoral support of staff. Their embeddedness in the staff structure also ensures they are more keenly aware of what’s going on; as one manager comments, ‘the chaplaincy doesn’t exist in a closed bubble.’ Two of the senior chaplains also occupy nearby houses owned by the university, for which they pay minimal rent, and these are also used as a context for supporting students and the postgraduate residential student officers.

The Christian ethos of the university is well embedded in its everyday life, translated by some into a set of moral principles or values. As one manager put it, ‘Christian values [run] through everything we do, not Christianity as a faith, but Christian values’. They go on, describing the way the Christian identity of the university translates into a distinctive institutional culture:

It’s friendly to faith definitely, we’re that. It values faith, let’s be honest, it values people of faith in all sorts of ways. Our Governors are all people of faith, or the vast majority of them are. So it starts from the very, very top and permeates its way down. I think it values
faith, it recognises faith, but it also respects the idea of not having faith. And that’s why I think the idea of values is really important. In terms of how we operate here, it’s within an envelope of Christian values, which actually, even for somebody who isn’t of faith, is a positive thing. You don’t have to be religious to realise that being kind and those sorts of things is a really important part of life, what I would hope happens is, yes, it’s a place that values faith, but that it doesn’t ram faith down people’s throats. But I hope that it helps people understand that being of faith is a useful thing or a precious thing.

A sensitivity to matters of faith in general terms is reflected in the university’s approach to Prevent. One manager recounted how Prevent risked undermining the university’s aim of providing faith support that is open to all, by reinforcing the idea that certain groups are more suspect and therefore need to be monitored:

The Prevent agenda I think has made us quite cross as an institution...We welcome people of all faiths here and actually we shouldn’t be asking questions and making assumptions about people of particular faiths and we really struggled with that for a long time. And writing the required response to HEFCE, we actually found that very difficult because we didn’t want to be putting constraints onto people as a result of their religion...with all this monitoring of who is using your prayer room. I don’t really want to monitor who is using the prayer room because I want people to feel that they can use it and not be watched.

It is a symptom of how faith support is integrated into the broader systems of the university that this comment comes from a manager, not a member of the chaplaincy team. The preservation of a safe space for the expression and practice of faith is held up as a major institutional value, alongside an inclusivity that one manager views as an extension of its ecumenical ethos. Acknowledging how its church links had meant issues of gender and sexuality were often encountered as ‘hot potatoes’, they affirmed their ecclesiastical inclusivity as the basis for a more radical inclusivity, one that is issued in ‘a sense of tolerance and recognition of difference’:

Its whole policies are open to all, of all faith or any faith and that is equal to all irrespective of gender orientation [or] what have you. I’d say actually the chaplaincy is one of the parts of the university where that’s taken very seriously.

Chaplaincy at the Cathedrals Group university is viewed by the managers we spoke to as well-resourced and highly functional. Challenges had arisen, as they had in some other contexts, with respect to managing the work and expectations of voluntary chaplains, and fostering a clear strategic direction. The complex management structure integrates chaplaincy deeply into the university’s culture, but the emergent system of accountability is experienced by some as confusing. By ethos and in its position within the university, chaplaincy is highly privileged, almost enculturated; as one manager put it, ‘because it’s so integrated in the life of the university, it’s almost invisible, in a good way.’

Conclusion

Chaplains relate to their universities in a variety of ways, shaped in no small part by the resources available, which in turn are shaped by the historical legacy of campus-church relationships, and the enduring ethos of different institutions. A further important factor is the professional orientation of individual chaplains, and how this is perceived by university management. Our case studies exemplify an emerging diversity, but also indications of change that mark a shift away from presumptions that had been more dominant in the past, including that chaplaincy is anachronistic within the modern university and/or is only there for the benefit of a minority of students who affirm a faith. The forces that drive these changes emerge at a much higher and broader level, and reflect national changes in the landscape of higher education and British society more generally. It is to these broader contexts that we turn in the next chapter.
Chapter 5: Chaplains’ relationships beyond the university

Introduction

The previous chapter addressed the ways in which the university chaplain’s role and working life is shaped by the broader contexts of the university campus. The current chapter turns to contexts beyond the campus. In addition to serving their university, chaplains are also representatives (and often employees) of religious traditions that have their own organisational structures, expectations and, of course, values. Even the non-religious exception – humanist chaplains – are largely contained within the networks of training and accountability provided by Humanists UK, the country’s foremost humanist organisation. In this respect, the role of the chaplain is especially complex, as they are called upon to embody the values of their tradition, while serving two organisational masters. And chaplains – especially those who are full-time – must navigate this tension while embedded in the everyday life of the university, operationally at some distance from the life of the tradition they represent. The previous chapters have explored the various ways in which chaplains embody those traditions, especially via expressions of concern evident in the material and symbolic affirmation of faith or belief on campus, and in the pastoral support of staff and students. The present chapter explores how those traditions function as national organisations that resource, influence and support the work chaplains do. It then turns to a different kind of national context, exploring how recent changes in UK law – especially concerning equality and counter-terrorism – have inflected the pastoral work that chaplains engage in. As universities have called upon their staff to conform to institutional policies that reflect this legislation, chaplains again find themselves in a liminal position, and the later sections of this chapter examine how they negotiate emerging compatibilities and tensions between their own theological traditions, the ethos of their university, and its interpretation of UK law.

Do chaplains feel supported by their own tradition?

In our telephone survey of university chaplains, we asked ‘How satisfied are you with the support you receive from your religious organisation?’ 40.1% said they were ‘satisfied’; 28.8% were ‘very satisfied’, another 11.9% were dissatisfied (including 1.7% - just six individuals – who were ‘very dissatisfied’). 14.4% said they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. So a majority of 68.9% appear happy with the support they receive from their religious organisation (the figure was 66.7% for support received from university management, suggesting very similar levels of satisfaction). Neither religion nor type of university appear to have any statistically significant relationship with these patterns.

Around a third of all chaplains are given housing as part of their remuneration, mostly via their religious organisation and chiefly this applies to Anglican and Catholic chaplains who maintain chaplaincy responsibilities alongside parish duties. Interestingly, provision of housing does not make a significant difference to the levels of satisfaction described above. In other words, chaplains who are dissatisfied with the support they receive do not apparently associate this with a lack of support in providing them and their families with a place to live.

Those who had attended a training course or workshop run by their religion/belief organisation during the previous 12 months were more likely to be satisfied with the support they had received (72.2% compared to 66.1%), suggesting support via training does matter to chaplains working in universities.83

Not all chaplains are officially recognised by their religion or belief group as its representative in the university in which they work. This situation is only the case for a minority – around 10% – but this does seem to make a difference to levels of satisfaction. Most strikingly, among those who are officially recognised by their religion or belief group as chaplains, 70.9% are satisfied with the support they receive from it; among those not officially recognised, this figure is only 50%.84 It would be interesting to examine who these ‘unofficial’ chaplains are – proportionately, they are more

83. This correlation is not statistically significant to the conventional level (0.05), but it is close, and so worth noting (p= 0.108).
84. Among those officially recognised, 70.9% are satisfied with the support they receive, 13.9% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 11.7% are dissatisfied. Among those not officially recognised, the figures are 50%, 19.4% and 13.9% respectively (p=<0.005).
likely to be from non-Christian traditions and cross-tabulation analysis reveals that these are fairly evenly distributed among Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh and ‘Other’ traditions (see Figure 5.1).85

Among those categorised as from an ‘other’ religion, several described themselves in relation to traditions that do not have a single organisational body that could be called upon to authorise them (e.g. Pagan, spiritualist, Daoist). It is notable that between 20 and 30% of chaplains within established traditions of Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam and Sikhism were unauthorised. Jews were more likely, as are Christians, to be officially recognised – and this is likely to be due in large part to the strong support from the organisation University Jewish Chaplaincy. However, Jewish chaplains appear to be the exception among non-Christian chaplains. For the others, in the interests of further empowering them to have a stronger presence in UK higher education, national organisations representing these traditions might consider what they could do to reinforce their systems of support and accountability.

85. Interestingly, the five humanist chaplains who took part in the survey – three of whom registered as ‘no religion’ and two as ‘other’ – all affirmed that they were officially recognised, presumably as officially trained and endorsed by Humanists UK.
Local engagement

Given how many chaplains work on a fractional and/or voluntary basis, it is not surprising to find a high proportion also maintaining links with religious groups within the local area. Among those who named their second job, around a third were working in local religious ministry of some kind, often as parish priests or within a local congregation, synagogue or mosque in another capacity. Others worked for charities connected to their faith tradition, or in regional leadership for a church; a few worked as hospital or prison chaplains. The most obvious, basic role local religious bodies play vis-à-vis chaplains is endorsement or accreditation. Anglican clergy are licenced to officiate by their diocesan bishop, for example (regardless of what a university requires or who is funding the chaplaincy post); Catholic priests are appointed to be chaplains by their bishop, many remaining in parish ministry at the same time. More substantive roles for local religious officials do emerge though, as with the trust that funds the chaplain at the red brick university, and the Anglican archdeacon local to the post-1992 university, who serves as diocesan line manager to the university chaplain. When the previous chaplain left, and the role of the chaplain was reconfigured, it was the archdeacon who drafted the new Memorandum of Understanding between the diocese and university. This work is appreciated by other chaplains, not least as it appears to mobilise local churches in supporting students; religious bodies extend their work into the university vacations, when university services are less available but many international students are still present. The Methodist chaplain from the same university was impressed by the work of Friends International, and remarked how this arrangement works:

…my work with Friends International is very, very much locally supported by the local churches. [T]he students who come with the Christian faith [have] to be supported and nurtured…they have to be grounded and linked to a local church… [some international students] want to find out about the Church… because of friendships with local people. So…having this connection with local churches is very important for us…[there are] churches actively involved with students but then…there are other churches who either financially give and also part of our work is very much also families hosting students.

This work is appreciated by other chaplains, not least as it appears to mobilise local churches in supporting students by organising a range of popular social events, meals and study sessions. They have also established a support network that extends into the university vacations, when university services are less available but many international students are still around. The Methodist chaplain from the same university was impressed by the work of Friends International, and remarked on how it had facilitated greater engagement with students among the local Methodist community:

…that’s a good link we have with the local Methodist church, in fact, we’ve appointed one of the lay preachers of the church there to act as a chaplaincy link and assistant chaplaincy role with the university here [so] that’s extremely helpful.

Some of our interviewees explained how they integrate their involvement in local religious groups into their work as university chaplains, often as a means of linking students to local congregations and drawing on the resources of local communities to support their work with students. Sometimes this is carried out on the chaplain’s own initiative, recognising the benefits of linking up the social capital of campus and local community. In other cases the work is more organised and intentional. Friends International is a Christian charity that works with international students in around 40 locations across the UK, via working with international students directly and equipping churches to do so. It operates in 40 university towns and cities and has 60 full- or part-time workers. Their aim is to enrich the experience international students have during their time at UK universities, as well as giving them an opportunity to hear more about the Christian faith (a goal that reflects their evangelical identity). Some Friends International workers are welcomed onto chaplaincy teams. Their work is well resourced by paid employees, but also depends on voluntary assistance, including via local churches. We interviewed one Friends International chaplain at the 1960s campus case study university, who described how this arrangement works:

In a few cases local or regional bodies play a role in the selection and appointment of chaplains, as recounted to us by a chair of a local workplace chaplains group near to the 1960s campus university. This happens more frequently when chaplains work voluntarily, and local religious communities can be called upon to be nominating bodies when a university identifies a gap in chaplaincy provision. This process has been formalised in the red brick case study, where local religious groups act as formal ‘sponsors’ of their chaplaincy representative, who serves for a limited period subject to the local group’s endorsement. So local bodies are drawn into systems of accountability as well as processes of appointment. But these arrangements are largely juridical; relationships that have more practical significance within the everyday life of chaplaincy are also in evidence, and can make a great deal of difference to the work chaplains are enabled to do.
The often limited resources available to chaplains on campus makes external assistance an attractive prospect; we came across other examples of external bodies contributing to the support of students through funding or organisation of events. These were largely Christian organisations – and there appears to be an especially strong body of support of this kind within the Roman Catholic community – but more informal relationships were also evident amongst non-Christian chaplaincy work as well. The Jewish chaplain at the red brick university maintained links with the local synagogue, where he had once been president, while the Sikh chaplain at the post-1992 university linked students up with the local Gurdwara in running a scheme to feed homeless people in the city. Chaplains look to their local communities for collaborative assistance and for opportunities through which students might develop as members of their faith tradition.

We interviewed a number of representatives of religious organisations local to our case study universities, individuals who had experience working with university chaplains. All of these interviewees were Christian leaders, something accountable in part to the more firmly embedded status of church-related organisations; archdeacons and bishops are more visible and more accessible, although it was also partly down to who was available to be interviewed in the local area. The following comments thus relate specifically to Christian networks and organisations. The emerging picture suggests connections between chaplains and local religious groups reflect circumstances that appear to differ between denominations and localities, with some idiosyncratic arrangements that are particular to specific circumstances (e.g. trusts set up long ago which fund chaplaincy work; a workplace chaplains committee that serves chaplaincy provision in one area but not others; arrangements with universities that are based on bespoke Memoranda of Understanding). The general pattern is fairly hands-off, with local church leaders playing either a more formal role of authorisation but not induction (leaving day to day accountability to the university), or being responsible for resource management (buildings, admin support, funds) but leaving day to day operations to the chaplain. Much might be explained by lack of resources, and several interviews recounted how local involvement used to be more significant than it now is.

Connections with local religious communities also extend across faith groups, and the typically inclusive ethos shared by university chaplains often means they are positively inclined towards inter-faith initiatives. How this works varies from place to place, depending on the time, energy and interests of individual chaplains. Sometimes the multi-faith constituency of the chaplaincy team itself facilitates local inter-faith relationships, as colleagues are invited to one another’s places of worship and develop a habit of attending regular events there. In other cases, inter-faith activity develops more as an extension of a value-based conviction, as with the Friends International chaplain who, while working for an evangelical organisation, also had a ‘a real desire to connect with people from the Islamic faith [on] a friendship level’, including working with refugee families in the local area, or the post-1992 university Anglican chaplain who has made building inter-faith relations the hallmark of his chaplaincy.

Occasionally, examples emerged of inter-faith relationships being built up organically via independent initiatives that bring different community members together under a common banner. This was described by an Anglican bishop local to one of our case studies. Here, representatives of the university, local churches and mosques had collaborated via their involvement in the local chapter of Citizens UK, the community organising alliance that brings together organisations in civil society to campaign for positive social change in their local area. As he commented:

[A colleague] at the university who is head of employability, and various others, have helped bring the student body on board with Citizens UK…So, faith groups, charities, education and so on. But that will mean that the university and faith leaders like…the local imam…the president of the mosque, and various other religious leaders will be brought in to the life of the university in a closer way because of the Citizens Alliance.

In most cases, inter-faith initiatives emerge from the interests of individual chaplains, but occasionally the values underpinning these endeavours make their way into the culture of the university more broadly. Staff at the Cathedrals Group university recognised value in being a source of guidance for students of any faith, not necessarily through

87. Our interviews with chaplains, university managers and national religious leaders suggest connections between university chaplains and local religious communities are by no means restricted to Christian networks. In fact, there was plenty of evidence to suggest a wide range of complex relationships across and between the faith groups, as we discuss later in this section. One challenge of future research might be to identify how local networks of Hindus, Jews, Muslims and Sikhs contribute to the resourcing and work of university chaplains representing their respective traditions.
engaging them from a Christian perspective but more pragmatically, as a means of referring them to individuals and communities from their own tradition who might be able to help. As one of its senior managers told us:

…even though it’s a Christian chaplaincy here, there are good relationships with other religious organisations around the city…which again I think is really important…for the student body because we have Muslim students and Buddhist students, so actually being able make those connections in my view is a really important part of their work. When a Muslim student goes to them they may be able to help them pastorally but actually they really also need to know who to pass them onto in the city or how to help a student from another religion find a group that they can worship with. I view that as a really important part of their role.

In this respect chaplaincy – and to a degree, in this case, the university as a whole – is conceived as a repository of knowledge and awareness about matters of faith, a triage service based on a rare concentration of religious literacy within a secular city. It is interesting to reflect on how the university’s Christian identity as an institution might enable or frustrate this multi-faith aspiration.

In summary, local religious organisations play a role in shaping the work of university chaplains in several key ways: as a means of official accreditation or endorsement; as a source of professional support in post (e.g. advocating for the chaplain, negotiating arrangements with the university, mentoring); and in expanding the networks within which the chaplain functions and from which they might gain further support and inspiration. The latter is especially interesting as the basis for building inter-faith relationships, and highlights the capacity a chaplaincy role has for bridging between communities under a common cause or set of values.

Variations in chaplaincy oversight at the national level

Beyond the local or regional level, university chaplains also have connections with national organisations. In order to get a sense of how these various organisations function and resource chaplaincy in higher education, we interviewed individuals who work in a senior capacity for them. The following descriptions are based on these interviews.

The Church of England

Support issued by the Church of England for its university chaplains is channelled through its central Education Office and is the specific responsibility of its National Policy Advisor for Further and Higher Education, based at Church House in London. The role has a policy and advisory function, including in relation to chaplaincy in FE and HE. More specifically, the job of the advisor is to articulate the Church of England’s position on the role of chaplaincy in these institutions, engage external agencies (including government) in communicating this, and advise more directly about the appointment and role of chaplains within different university contexts. While the Church of England has an authorising role with respect to its ordained chaplains (the situation with lay chaplains is less clear), this is performed at the regional level by diocesan bishops. Nevertheless, chaplaincy appointments are often a joint project undertaken by the university and diocese, and the policy advisor sometimes has an advisory role in this process. The advisor’s role also extends to one of facilitation, including the production of a chaplains’ newsletter, offering training opportunities, and contributing, along with Roman Catholic and Methodist colleagues, to the organisation of the annual ecumenical CHELG conference 88, in addition to bespoke advice and interventions upon invitation by specific universities or chaplaincies.

In addition, Anglican chaplains working in Cathedrals Group universities enjoy support from the Colleges and Universities of the Anglican Communion (CUAC), a global network of universities affiliated with the Anglican Communion, including the ten Anglican members of the UK’s Cathedrals Group Universities. Its international triennial conference includes a bespoke additional component for chaplains, and the member chaplains are involved formally in the CUAC seminars and events, and informally in supporting one another (e.g. fund-raising for colleagues in troubled parts of the world). CUAC’s British Chapter aims to facilitate support for Anglican chaplains chiefly via an annual conference, which includes elements that aid ministerial and professional development. There is also an annual Cathedrals Group Chaplains conference that includes Anglican, Roman Catholic, Methodist and other Christian chaplains.

88. The Churches Higher Education Liaison Group (CHELG) consists of the national officers or representatives of the main Christian denominations in the UK. In addition to the annual conference, CHELG organises the annual New Chaplains Training Course and occasional study days, and so provides valued ecumenical support for the ministry of university chaplains. It is chaired by representatives of different member traditions on a revolving basis.
The Roman Catholic Church

The Roman Catholic Church also has a dedicated staff member responsible for HE chaplains. The role of the National Coordinator of Catholic chaplains in HE is to support the network of Catholic chaplains, rather than organise their work, and to keep Bishops informed about any relevant issues. The Coordinator is employed by the Catholic Bishops Conference in England and Wales. Roman Catholic chaplains, similar to the Church of England, are appointed by Diocesan bishops. The Coordinator also sees their role as a two-way interpreter: explaining Roman Catholic perspectives and issues to non-Roman Catholics, and interpreting the institutional contexts of HE and chaplaincy to the Roman Catholic Church and its representatives. The Coordinator developed a handbook for Catholic chaplains in HE which is sent to all new appointees. They keep a close eye on the network of Catholic chaplains working in universities at the present time, and they were able to cite figures based on recent research for the number of Roman Catholic chaplains in higher education across England and Wales. The figure cited was 110 (of whom 63 are clergy). So Catholic chaplaincy is far less represented in the UK’s universities than Anglican chaplaincy, and depends to a much larger extent on lay involvement.

The Methodist Church

The Methodist Church employs a Ministry Development Officer who has HE chaplaincy within their remit, although only one day a week is allocated to this. By their reckoning there are 64 Methodist chaplains across England and Scotland, some full-time, but many part-time, who are local ministers paid by the local Methodist circuit, and there have been reductions in provision of late due to diminishing resources more generally. Funding for a chaplaincy post usually comes via the circuit. Some chaplains are appointed to a specific station as Methodist chaplains (i.e. to an existing ministerial role), others apply to be ecumenical or free church chaplains. In places where there is no Methodist chaplain, contact details of the local Methodist minister are made available. Appointments to chaplaincy positions are usually made via joint consultation with the relevant university and the Methodist Church, within an arrangement of ‘dual accountability’. The Methodist Church offers initial training to its chaplains (convened in November each year, so they have some term-time experience to reflect on) and ongoing support via the CHELG conference. Induction is managed by the relevant university.

The Church of Scotland

The Church of Scotland employs a ministry support officer, who has within their remit liaison and communication between the central Church and its chaplains working in universities, hospitals, prisons, work places and the armed forces. While the Scottish context includes far fewer universities (just 15), the support officer is stretched very thin and constrained resources mean there is limited involvement from the centre. Involvement in appointments is minimal – restricted to the occasional reference or perhaps an invitation to sit on an interview panel – and ministers can apply for chaplain’s roles directly to the university advertising the post, without formal authorisation from the central Church of Scotland. While there are theological reasons for this that have to do with the understanding of the Presbyterian minister, the increasing separation of central Church from chaplains is also attributable to a change of funding arrangements. The ministry support officer shared with us how the Church used to jointly fund chaplaincy appointments, but had to withdraw from this over the past few years due to depletion of central resources, so the Church has a diminished stake in university chaplaincy. However, and in contrast to the situation south of the border, this has led to a situation in which Church of Scotland chaplains are for the most part paid by their universities.

The Muslim community

Existing without a national organisational structure of governance, and lacking a tradition of chaplaincy within their own faith, Muslim chaplaincy in the UK has evolved largely in an ad hoc fashion, in response to the challenges faced by the broader British Muslim community. Within universities, this initially took the form of an advisory role as institutions strived to serve the needs of more religiously diverse student bodies.

89. The full details are as follows: 110 chaplains, of whom 63 are clergy, 40 of whom are also parish priests; 16 are full-time chaplains; 7 are part-time chaplains with other roles, e.g. secretary to bishop, teaching in seminary; 22 are full-time lay chaplains; 15 full-time religious, 10 part-time religious; 8 Deacons; plus a range of more complex arrangements. Via our telephone interviews with 99 lead chaplains, we identified 148 Roman Catholic chaplains, but this also includes universities in Scotland and Northern Ireland, which explains, at least in part, the disparity between these two sets of figures.

90. Our telephone interviews with lead chaplains identified 78 Methodist chaplains; the disparity may be attributable to a proportion who are not ‘officially recognised’ by their denomination.
Ground-breaking here was the establishment of the certificate in Muslim chaplaincy at Markfield Institute of Higher Education near Leicester in 2003, which was steered by an advisory board and tutors from across religious traditions and including humanists. Its originators were keen to learn from the existing, well-developed Christian tradition of chaplaincy and expose Muslim students to a range of perspectives. The course included text-based religious study, skills development, and 60 hours of placement work (those already working as chaplains had to go somewhere else to do this, in order to expand their horizons). Starting with 11 students, probably around 300 have completed the course since it started. Its founders deliberately adopted the language of ‘chaplaincy’—even though a Christian term—because it fitted with the legal structures of the UK, was established as a recognised term, and alternative Islamic terms would not be appropriate (including ‘Imam’, which would also exclude women). The Markfield Institute has since developed its training provision into an MA level programme in chaplaincy, as has happened in other locations, most notably Cardiff, with its Centre for Chaplaincy Studies. The aim of this was to raise the standard of Muslim chaplaincy (via a process of accreditation) and encourage chaplains to engage more concertedly with relevant textual sources alongside practical training. Centres of Islamic education like Markfield have no role in the appointment of chaplains beyond agreeing to circulate the occasional job advertisement; this process rests entirely with the university.

The Jewish community

The organisation University Jewish Chaplaincy is an Orthodox Jewish organisation (the President of which is the Chief Rabbi). It is concerned with supporting Jewish chaplains and ensuring life for Jewish students is safe and productive. It is a charitable organisation supported by Jewish philanthropy. Jewish chaplains are hired by the organisation as chaplaincy couples (the rabbi and his wife together on a 1.5 contract), and links with Rabbinic schools enable candidates to be recruited usually straight from training, with experience of western universities an important consideration. When a post becomes available, Jewish students (via JSocs91) are consulted prior to the appointment, and have a delegate on the interview panel, and local consultation is a major part of the process. They usually only hire a couple in which the man has orthodox ordination training as well as practical rabbinic training. Induction into multi-faith teams takes place via the university, but Jewish chaplains also have to attend a 5 day period of residential training every August before term starts. Integration into multi-faith teams is expected, but the organisation makes it clear that the chaplain’s job is to serve Jewish students, and accountability is to University Jewish Chaplaincy as an organisation, which is paying for and facilitating the appointment. The organisation employs about 20 chaplaincy couples across the UK, some covering large areas and several universities, others having a more focused remit because of high concentrations of Jewish students. There is also an independent ultra-orthodox organisation called Chabad that sends emissaries to universities who seek chaplain status.

The Sikh community

There is a UK Sikh Healthcare Chaplaincy Group which was set up in 2005 with funding from the NHS, its purpose being the authorisation and training of Sikh chaplains, and the continued raising of awareness about the Sikh community across the UK. All Sikh chaplaincy is voluntary, a consequence of practical limitations on resources and of theological resources particular to Sikhism (there is no word for ‘chaplain’ in Sikh tradition, so instead Sikhs use the word ‘Sevadaar’, a Punjabi term which means ‘one who carries out selfless service’). The limited national support network for Sikh chaplains appears to focus on healthcare chaplaincy, and our case study research suggests Sikh chaplains are appointed on an ad hoc, responsive basis, drawing in existing staff who happen to be Sikh, who then, if willing, make the role their own.

The Hindu community

The Hindu community also has no national network of university chaplains, although Hindu chaplaincy is developing a distinct identity and approach thanks to a staff member at the Oxford Centre for Hindu Studies. They got drawn into chaplaincy after the informal support they were offering to Hindu students evolved into a formal role; these students’ pastoral needs were not being met by existing chaplaincy provision as it was not informed by their own traditions and values (including ethical dilemmas). Since then they have been asked to advise on similar developments globally, and have been developing a course in Hindu chaplaincy in order to set a standard that’s rigorous, accountable and based on

---

91. Jewish Societies run by and for university students (just as ISocs refers to Islamic Societies).
good research (reflecting concerns about non-accreditation given what they see as the low standard of practice among those claiming Hindu chaplain status, e.g. in prisons). In this respect, Hindu chaplaincy is in nascent form, and has arisen in response to student need and, like the Muslim example, out of an academic’s concern that chaplaincy be formally accredited and accountable.

The Buddhist community

The chair of the Buddhist Healthcare Chaplaincy Trust also functions as Buddhist contact for higher education, and runs an informal network of around 20-25 Buddhist university chaplains. Their role is chiefly advisory, but they are much more active in healthcare chaplaincy, which is subject to far more regulatory measures than university chaplaincy. The chair comments that the main focus of provision within Buddhist university chaplaincy is meditation classes, which attract lots of non-Buddhists. Their facilitation role is informal and advisory, although, like the Hindu example, might be developed in future.

UK Humanists

One of the most significant and fascinating developments within university chaplaincy in recent years has seen humanist chaplains achieve a much more established status. This arose out of research conducted by Humanists UK (formerly the British Humanist Society), which identified a felt need for chaplaincy that is non-religious (e.g. non-religious people in hospital want pastoral support from someone who is like-minded). However, they also found that the title ‘chaplain’ was a barrier to engagement as most people assume this is a religious function, so instead, they use the title of ‘pastoral carer’. Humanists UK developed a training and endorsement programme for these ‘pastoral carers’ to equip and accredit individuals to perform this role in different institutional settings. The training takes place over a weekend (and is assessed) and is held all over the country. These courses have been running since 2013; about 5 courses happen each year with around 12 people on each course (so there are around 300 accredited humanist pastoral carers in the system at the time of writing). There is also a requirement that those going through the course continue on a programme of continuing professional development afterwards. Most graduates of the programme go on to work in hospitals, some in prisons, but not many in universities, and at the time of writing, Humanists UK have confirmed that they currently have just 5 accredited pastoral carers working in UK universities.92 The national organisation’s role is chiefly to endorse and accredit, but also to oversee related issues of quality control, which includes the need for individuals to be willing and able to work as part of a broader chaplaincy team, rather than being an evangelist for humanism or anti-religious. They also provide training, and ongoing support, e.g. through regional networks.

Discussion: Comparing national support networks

National-level support for university chaplains varies considerably by religion or belief group, and the uneven resourcing also reflects complex institutional histories and the theological and ethical frameworks that inform habits of practice within different traditions. Unsurprisingly, the Christian provision is weighted heavily in favour of the Anglicans and Roman Catholics – especially the Anglicans – due to broader patterns of dominance in UK society as a whole. The Church of Scotland and British Methodism – both rapidly shrinking churches – represent a diminishment of resources that reflects their national profile in terms of people, buildings and money. It is interesting that the withdrawal of central funds has had different consequences for these two denominations, with the Church of Scotland apparently managing to maintain a reasonably strong presence in Scotland’s universities, due to a willingness by those institutions to invest funding in chaplaincy. This may in part be explained by the presence of four traditional elite universities (almost a third of the total), which our evidence suggests are more inclined to treat chaplaincy as a valuable part of university life.

The situation for minority religious communities also varies, from the level of an informal network for Buddhists and Hindus, not even this for Sikh university chaplains, to the highly organised and well-resourced Orthodox Jewish case. The latter also illustrates a possible consequence of external funding, with the role of Jewish chaplains explicitly defined as relating to the Jewish student community. While this is, in a sense, understandable from the point of view of preserving distinctive cultures of religious practice in a majority non-Jewish context, it also sits uncomfortably alongside the more inclusive, broad vision affirmed among many Christian chaplains that has achieved its own kind of institutional orthodoxy across the HE sector.

92. Humanists UK typically identify potential university placements on the basis of the strength of the student run Humanist Society at that institution. In this respect their approach is responsive, although as these societies are subject to a regular change in personnel in alignment with the student cycle, it is perhaps unsurprising that not many chaplaincy placements have become established in the longer term. There are clearly also humanist university chaplains working outside of the auspices of Humanists UK; our telephone interviews with lead chaplains identified 16 humanist chaplains working across 89 universities.
The Muslim and Hindu examples illustrate efforts to serve their communities in a way that is recognised within the British context, borrowing from established Christian models of chaplaincy in order to gain legitimacy and enrich an emerging new tradition of religious practice. UK humanists have demonstrated how non-religious identities are increasingly borrowing the legal and cultural language of religion in order to secure a place at the table, as well as how a well-funded and legally aware organisational centre can secure significant recognition, even when demand on the ground remains apparently quite limited.

We asked these national representatives ‘what influence, if any, can you bring to bear on HE policy decisions?’ Their highly contrasting answers make the differential powers enjoyed by different groups strikingly apparent. The Anglican policy adviser was able to give a detailed and expansive response featuring several complex examples such as the following.

[O]ne of the areas…of great concern during the passage of the [Higher Education and Research] bill was…inadvertently very large, probably urban, and probably research-intensive universities would end up coming out better than small, specialist and non-metropolitan [universities]. So one of the things we worked on very hard, across the denominational and institutional divide…that brought together the Cathedrals Group, Guild HE…the University Alliance…[was] to seek to preserve in legislation and therefore in policy the fact that the Office For Students must have due regard to a proper ecology [of universities] that’s genuinely diverse…So…if one thinks of the legislative and regulatory side as a dimension of policy, we have a contribution to make there.

This contrasted starkly with the response from the Hindu representative: ‘About as much influence as a slug has over where you’re going to plant your lettuce. I’ll be there when you plant it. I’ll find my way, but after that point…No.’ The other Christian representatives were not quite so pessimistic, although the Methodist was acquiescent to the imbalance of power and pragmatic in his response: ‘I think the only Church that’s likely to have some clout really is the established Church for all sorts of historical reasons and that it makes huge sense for our Church just to be part of that really.’ Most interestingly, perhaps, is the representative from Humanists UK, who described how they have resources to press a legal argument based on equality, and have done this (although haven’t had to go to court yet), in order to have their place at the table recognised as legitimate. He suspects the smaller faith communities might be in the same boat in often being excluded, and yet do not have the resources to challenge this.

**Negotiating with national legal frameworks**

Some of the challenges faced by university chaplains that have been discussed were reiterated by the local religious leaders reflecting on how chaplaincy had changed over the past ten years. Some referred to the massive growth in student numbers since the 1990s, highlighting a correspondingly rising number of students with physical or mental problems who need pastoral support. Others highlighted the converse shrinking of the proportion of religious students, or the migration of Christian students away from on-campus chapel worship and towards large evangelical churches in the local area. A combination of expanding workload and diminishing religious constituency reflects how the chaplain’s role has been compelled to forge a vision that is broad-based and religiously inclusive, at least among those who are employed as chaplains and whose responsibilities are therefore (at least in part) defined by the university. As the Anglican bishop local to the Cathedrals Group university put it, “…the phrase, ‘ministry to the institution’ has grown, even as the institutions have grown and have become less ministrable to [sic].” A key challenge arising from this is maintaining the distinctiveness of chaplaincy work, under pressure to confine oneself to one’s own religious group (among voluntary or minority religious chaplains), or to have one’s role collapsed into a form of professional student support (among full-time paid chaplains).

These are challenges of relevance and role definition, contingent on a set of changing broader contexts. A more particular set of challenges has arisen in recent years and deserves separate attention: legislative changes that have had an impact on how the chaplain functions and what roles they are called upon to play within the wider work of the university. The first of these changes relates to the Equality Act (2010) as well as associated issues of equality, diversity and inclusion, which frame a great deal of what is happening within UK universities at the present time. The Equality Act brought together a number of previously disparate anti-discrimination laws, and introduced the idea of ‘protected characteristics’, nine identity markers - including gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and religion or belief. The Act requires equal treatment in employment and in public and private services, with respect to all of these protected characteristics. Ministers of religion are exempt from the Act, and so religious organisations cannot be compelled to appoint women to the priesthood, for example. However, the legislation nevertheless impacts on university chaplaincy, not least because equality and diversity has been embraced by higher education as a positive value framework that coheres with its existing self-image as a bastion of enlightened thinking and cultural inclusivity. As a consequence, it has
acquired significant power in shaping institutional cultures that go way beyond simple compliance with the law. Two specific consequences for chaplaincy are worth noting.

First, it couples ‘religion’ with ‘belief’, belief defined as ‘any religious or philosophical belief and a reference to belief includes a reference to a lack of belief.’93 In other words, those affirming non-religion – including an apparently growing number among young people, many of whom are university students – may appeal to an entitlement to express their non-religious identity by referring to legislation that places it on a par with religious identity. Whereas before, those of no religion were viewed in terms of an absence (not being religious), the Equality Act legitimises and reinforces existing cultural trends towards affirming non-religion as a positive self-ascription, a development that in part explains the growth of humanist chaplaincy.

Second, it embeds within a legal framework an obligation to recognise and provide for a range of religious identities, making any kind of religious hegemony – whether formal or accidental – much more difficult to justify. This is a potentially unsettling development for Christian chaplains within red brick, 1960s campus and post-1992 university contexts, as it is here where the more religiously diverse student populations are based, and here where chaplains are least likely to secure central funding from their universities. We mentioned in the previous chapter how the 1960s campus university which took part in our study had a majority of Christian chaplains, but the most well attended chaplaincy events were attended by Muslims. We might expect it to be increasingly difficult for chaplains to retain university support in the form of resources, unless they are seen to be serving an identifiably broad range of faiths. This requirement is less likely to be salient in some traditional elite universities due to the limited visible religious diversity on campus, something that also, in a sense, applies to the Cathedrals Group institutions. It is noteworthy that, among the other three case studies, it is the post-1992 university’s Anglican chaplain who appears to have the most secure relationship with his university’s management. This is in part attributable to a gregarious and hardworking personality, but it also has to do with how his theological convictions and ethical disposition are both entirely compatible with the university’s ethos of inclusion. Most importantly, perhaps, he approaches his work through an inter-faith lens, and has become trusted as a custodian of this form of chaplaincy.

This chaplain may be remarkable in his success, but he is by no means exceptional in his outlook. Studies of Christian chaplaincy have long noted the tendency of this form of ministry to attract those on the fringes of the broader church, and this is to some degree borne out in the evidence collected for this project. An Anglican bishop we interviewed local to the Cathedrals Group case study puts it well:

…frequently you find that the people who advocate for the Church to change its view, for example on same-sex marriage, are university chaplains. Because they are at home in an institution that blesses them, and they don’t really like the Church, that’s why they went into chaplaincy. So it is quite a complicated area in which to work, especially given that quite large numbers of staff in universities are also members of conservative Christian churches, and some of them get themselves elected to the appointing bodies for chaplains so that the culture wars which are fought out in the General Synod every flipping time, are replicated in universities.

Chaplains working in universities tend to affirm a perspective that is largely in keeping with the values of equality and diversity so publicly celebrated (and often fought over) in higher education contexts. And yet this synergy is not necessarily recognised by other members of the university community. Equality legislation arguably makes the status of chaplains more vulnerable, especially if policies on inclusion are pitched over and against any religiously specific provision. And yet if the broad and inclusive vision of chaplaincy is communicated more effectively across universities, chaplains embracing this perspective are more likely – as in the case of the post-1992 university chaplain – to have their role not only endorsed by university managers, but integrated into a broader institutional programme of support. As he puts it himself, ‘I think the diversity and equality has become a bigger agenda for universities and, and if you have a chaplaincy that’s clearly in line with those ideas and is behind that then that’s a…good thing for a university.’

The second piece of legislation relates to the UK government’s counter terrorism framework (called CONTEST), reinforced in recent years by the Counter Terrorism and Security Act (2015) and its associated Prevent strategy. Prevent is the part of the CONTEST programme that is concerned with addressing the underlying triggers of

93. See https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/section/10 (accessed 18/12/18)
terrorist activity, its aim being to counter terrorist ‘ideology’ and deter potential terrorists from pursuing this line of action. This includes the government’s de-radicalisation programme – Channel – which pursues interventionist strategies implemented by local police working alongside community leaders, including Muslims, in order to persuade those vulnerable to radicalisation onto a different path. The ‘Prevent Duty’ refers to the obligations this strategy places on public bodies, which are collectively charged, according to the Counter Terrorism and Security Act, with having ‘due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism.’ In practice, this means all schools, universities, prisons, local councils, and hospitals are required to submit an annual report to the government and demonstrate that they have systems in place for intervening should episodes of ‘radicalisation’ come to light.

These developments have been controversial, especially in universities, within which there has been a considerable counter-response (Brown and Saeed 2014). Academics and students alike have cited infringements of religious freedom, demonisation of Muslims, and a movement towards a surveillance culture on campus that is out of keeping with the tradition of free and frank intellectual debate many still see as integral to the life of a healthy university. Some chaplains echo these concerns, and see their work as impacted negatively by a corresponding change in organisational culture. For example, the Methodist chaplain at the 1960s campus university expresses some suspicion that increased provision for chaplaincy is coming with greater control from the centre, and that this is coloured by Prevent:

...they now want to make an appointment which apparently will oversee the work of the management committee...So one could say, well they’re coming very heavy-handed in a way, and it’s beginning to look as if they want to manage what we’re doing in a much more firm way. You wonder what the motivation for this is, as I say, inevitably you suspect that the Prevent agenda is having some effect here, and they are realising that they’ve got a responsibility to make sure what’s done here is done properly.

However, not all chaplains responded altogether negatively about the changes this legislation has brought about. At the traditional elite university, the chaplain appears to have intervened in a way that has enabled the Prevent Duty to be implemented in a more collaborative and informed fashion, and may have helped build relationships between university management and students of different faiths. It’s affected my work from the point of view that it’s part of my work and I do what I can to help others on the committee understand things from the student’s point of view. I sort of brokered a meeting between the presidents of the faith societies and the two people who are leading the Prevent agenda here, it took a bit of time to persuade them that the most important people for them to talk to were the presidents of the Jewish, Christian and Muslim societies. And as of this year I have, we have, as a matter of course, told all groups who are using this building that if they are having an external speaker, let us know who that is in advance. We didn’t do that until this year, so that’s a change.

Other chaplains had done the Prevent training and were either indifferent or quite positive about the experience. Some had seen material benefits arising from it, like the Sikh chaplain at the post-1992 university, who explained how the safeguarding measures put in place as part of the Prevent Duty had helped identify a case of a female student who was being groomed by a sexual predator. At the same institution, the Anglican lead chaplain had secured funding for the Muslim chaplain using Prevent as part of the justification, acknowledging that it had been strategically beneficial to be able to cite Prevent in securing the services of an excellent chaplain with strong links to the local community.

An interesting, recurring pattern here is that some chaplains simply describe the structures that have been put in place so that the university is in conformity with Prevent (e.g. keeping a register of public speakers, monitoring speakers, doing Prevent training), but without offering any obvious view about whether this is a good thing or not. Perhaps this is evidence of its normalisation within contemporary higher education? On the other hand, some chaplains say their work has not been touched by Prevent at all, and at least one had never heard of it. So exposure to Prevent guidelines varies, and for some – as with all of the university managers we spoke to – it has simply become an established part of working in a university, a set of procedures to implement, rather than a state incursion to resist. It may also be the case that, post the referendum on Brexit, far right activity has become more visible, and so even those with reservations about Prevent see it in a different light as a measure for addressing that social problem. Other chaplains have used it to their advantage, and recognised how the bureaucratic momentum behind this new legislation might be used as leverage in the service of more benign agendas.

We asked local and national religious leaders about Prevent in our interviews with them, and, interestingly, they appeared only marginally engaged with the issue. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the non-Christian leaders were more keenly aware of the delicacy of the matter, and the Muslim national leader underlined the importance of building a close relationship between the Muslim chaplain and the president of a university’s ISoc. Without this relationship of mutual trust and familiarity, it is more likely that suspicions will arise in the wider university that go unchallenged. There is much more to be explored among Muslim chaplains, not least as they are potentially key brokers in the tricky balance between security and religious inclusion.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored the various ways in which university chaplaincy is framed and informed by agendas, organisations and social changes that proceed at the local and national levels. In this respect it complements the preceding chapter, which examined the influence of forces that exist within the precincts of university campuses and which form the social relations that make up university life. It is important to consider both sets of factors, not least because chaplains are caught up in a complex matrix of immediate, local and national forces that present ongoing challenges for their purpose within the university sector. They raise questions of role definition, resources, accountability, even loyalty insofar as issues of religious, moral and cultural values emerge. These are not easily managed or resolved, and demand serious engagement with the theological and ideological contexts that inform understandings of vocation and status among university chaplains; we return to these issues in our concluding chapter.
Chapter 6: The impact and effectiveness of university chaplaincy

‘Without the support of the chaplaincy, both chaplains and other groups, I don’t know how I would have coped. It has been central to my university experience.’

(Christian home student, 1960s campus university)

This section examines the impact and effectiveness of chaplaincy according to the different groups involved in it: chaplains, university managers, local and national religion and belief organisations, and students. It asks whether and how chaplaincy’s impact is measured and investigates how effective each group thinks university chaplaincy is. The chapter uses data from interviews with university managers, chaplains, local religious organisations and students in or close to the five case study universities. The data reveal that chaplains have an impact on their universities on several levels – on an individual, a group of students or staff, or the organisational or cultural life of the whole university. Chaplains and managers see chaplains’ greatest impact as occurring through one-to-one work with individual students. Students endorse this, but emphasise also the physical space of welcome that the chaplaincy provides. Yet although chaplains, managers and students readily provide examples of impact, recording of impact (for example, numbers of students chaplains see) is not systematic, and university chaplaincy differs from healthcare and prison chaplaincy, where a more formal record of impact is often required. The chapter ends with an analysis of the national picture, drawing on telephone interviews with 367 chaplains who were asked about the impact of their work within their own universities. This analysis shows that the most impactful chaplains are those who work more hours, are paid, and are paid by the university (rather than an external source). It draws out several emerging implications for chaplaincy in the future.

‘Effective for the people who feel that they need it’

University managers and chaplains’ perspectives on the impact of chaplaincy at local university level

Asked ‘How effective do you think chaplaincy work is in your university?’ the chaplains and university managers we interviewed in our five case study universities were positive about chaplaincy, with a few suggesting improvements. They discussed similar themes: the importance of chaplains being visible on campus; effectiveness being often dependent on one or two good and prominent chaplains; the time demands of high-quality individual and small group support making it difficult to achieve cross-institutional impact; and they suggested improvements to how chaplaincy might be supported.

A good number of managers and chaplains thought chaplaincy was effective, but chaplains were sometimes hesitant in expressing this:

Interviewer: Yes, it is difficult I know, I just wanted your impressions.

Very active, dynamic, looking at different ways of approaching things and I think, yes I think it’s making its efforts to be effective, you know, it’s doing what it can to be effective. (Pagan chaplain, traditional elite)

Managers were generally less hesitant, even when they acknowledged that the answer depended on what view of chaplaincy one held:

I suppose it comes back to what you think it’s for, to measure its effectiveness…I would say it’s highly effective. Because it makes significant difference to individual students’ experience and lives. Particularly students who may be vulnerable, or be looking for some support. Very effective with international students. They run a lot of activities, chaplaincy events. Things that people can come together around. And that sense of belonging…I would say very effective…it’s also effective in terms of its, if you like, its core mission, of supporting individual students’ faith needs, and catering for those, and connecting them with other people of similar faith perhaps, or places of worship, or faith leaders from other faiths as they need.

(Deputy Director of Student Services, post-1992)
Visibility

Managers highlighted the visibility of chaplaincy as a good thing. ‘To me it’s highly visible’, said the post-1992 university Professor of Social Studies. The red brick Director of Student Experience highlighted the university’s recent decision to integrate chaplaincy within student services as exemplifying effectiveness:

It’s getting more effective because there is a greater sense of professionalism if that’s not too strong a word, around the management and the profile of the chaplains and the chaplaincy team. I think there is still work to do though, to make sure they are visible enough and that people know about them and the university has got a big part to play in that but also the chaplains themselves. So, yes, I’d say reasonably effective.

The red brick Head of Biology similarly referred to it as having gained ‘a positive dynamic’: ‘From what I’ve seen there it’s been very positive and growing actually, rather than something that’s quite insular, and that’s either standing still or maybe even going backwards.’

The traditional elite university chaplains were most likely to consider their chaplaincy visible and effective: they pointed to its chaplaincy’s prominent role in graduation and the chapel’s public media exposure. The Roman Catholic chaplain explained:

In the role that it’s been given it’s very effective. I think people are very aware of it. People are very aware of [the lead chaplain] for example and his role, he’s always given quite a high profile in a sense with university services, graduation services, he opens the service or…gives the instructions before the graduation begins, for example, and processes…I think it’s valued. Is it effective? Yeah, I think in what it’s meant to do, yeah, to lead services and to be there for the help of student groups, to offer them availability of their own contacts for faith, faith formation. Yeah, I’d say people are very much aware of it. We always get a stall at Freshers’ Fairs and those kind of things. I think it would be pointed out as well on open days, there’s always a stall on open days for the Chaplaincy. So I think it has quite a high presence.

When qualifying what makes chaplaincy effective, managers and chaplains emphasised two things in addition to visibility: the work of individual excellent chaplains, and the pastoral support work chaplains do with individuals and groups.

Individually excellent, prominent chaplains

Managers at the traditional elite seemed to hold the lead Christian chaplain in high esteem, and his effectiveness was equated with the chaplaincy’s effectiveness – for them, the chaplaincy was this person. As the Director of Student Services said, ‘I think the work that the Chaplain [our italics] does is very effective, yes. I don’t know so much about the Honorary Chaplains.’ The SU president said:

I think it works well because it’s quite informal, and I’d hesitate to say anything that would formalise the job. I think if you could make two of [names chaplain], I think it would be good. Honestly, I think what he does is brilliant. If anything, it’s just he does it alone as a chaplain. Sorry, we have other religious representatives, but he’s like the main full-time guy.

Part-time or volunteer chaplains were unsure about whether chaplaincy was effective due to their peripheral position in relation to more available and better connected full-timers. They could see their own and colleagues’ individual effectiveness, but had little sense of their chaplaincy’s wider impact. As the 1960s campus Friends International chaplain said:

I think the individual chaplains in their role possibly are very effective, so for example I have seen the Catholic chaplain, he probably has a real good impact on students from the Catholic background…but as a team together I’m not sure, either as a Christian chaplain or as Multi-faith chaplains, I don’t think we are being effective or I’m not sure how we can be effective together because we all have our own sort of area.

Personal support for students

Managers and chaplains considered the support work chaplains do with individuals and groups as effective, even if chaplaincy services or events did not attract large numbers:

Purely numerically, in terms of throughput or people attending the various services, in terms of attending acts of worship it’s quite small…We know that it’s a place where students who are struggling do locate themselves…In that sense it’s a safe space, and I think that’s very effective and the staff in other parts of the university, be they either academic or support, know that there is a buffer there, that is very useful.

(Head of Theology, Cathedrals Group)
Chaplains talked in more detail about the impact on individual students, which is unsurprising since managers only knew of this second hand. Some were hesitant about the extent to which one-to-one pastoral work constituted effectiveness:

I wonder what effective would look like if I’ve ended the day and I’ve had conversations with two or three students who were feeling sad about the fact they don’t get on with their flatmates or they’ve broken up with their boyfriend of two weeks and it’s the worst thing that’s ever happened in their whole lives…I don’t end the day thinking ‘yeah, I’ve been effective’, but actually maybe I have…in that person’s life at that moment (Anglican chaplain, red brick)

For the students who search us out, I think they are very happy to have this facility and I think we do a good job for them. But that’s a very small percentage of the students. If you asked me broadly how does the university perceive the chaplaincy, I would guess most students don’t know it exists, most students don’t understand the word ‘chaplaincy’, and we’re [on the margins of the campus] so we don’t have any physical presence at all. They have to search for us if they want to look on the website…Generally speaking we’re not that effective in the university as a whole (Methodist chaplain, 1960s campus)

Others were more optimistic about the impact of their support on students. The red brick Jewish chaplain pointed out that they had become an alternative welfare service for students:

I sometimes feel, there’s 17 of us and there’s 20,000 students and most of them don’t know we’re here, so are we being effective…we take people who the wellbeing system cannot cope with, the wellbeing system has a limited number of people, it has budgets, you can go to a wellbeing counsellor, see them three times and then you’re told your time’s up, we haven’t got any more money to spend on you. You say, ‘But I’m going to commit suicide next week’, well then, they might change their minds but we are beginning to act as an off-shoot for them, particularly if the worries are in not mental health but just life view. We’re frightened that we’ll be overwhelmed as well but we’re taking it on.

Overall, this chaplain said, ‘We don’t, between us, meet a lot of people, but those we do I think are well supported. The events we do are publicised and are generally well known and I think actually our effectiveness is improving.’ Similar sentiments were repeated by chaplains at several universities.

Ideas for greater effectiveness

Ideas for improvements were given by interviewees in all universities apart from the traditional elite (a reflection of the high esteem in which that chaplain was held by his colleagues). Some expressed a desire for chaplaincy to be more ‘embedded’ (Anglican Chaplain, post-1992) or for staff to stay at the university for longer. The post-1992 university Anglican chaplain was ambitious for the chaplaincy to be more effective (although it was considered very effective by managers):

I always want it to be more, I always hope it to be more but I’m going to be here for the next five years or so, so we’ll just embed it a bit more, and that will be good for…whoever comes after me.

Several Cathedrals Group chaplains referred to a time several years ago when they thought chaplaincy was more effective. Managers in the 1960s campus were keen to promote chaplaincy more:

I think it’s effective for the people that find their way to the chaplaincy space. What I would like to see is us trying to get the chaplaincy into the rest of the university. (Head of Student Support, 1960s campus)

They wanted to increase chaplaincy provision in the university’s smaller sites, and to give better support to the chaplains:

You never say things are perfect but I think on the whole it works well. I think we probably need to provide a little bit more information and guidance to them on how things work. (Head of Student Support, 1960s campus)

The university where staff were most likely to question the effectiveness of the chaplaincy was the red brick, where there had been significant changes over the last year or two.

The difference between chaplains and managers’ views was that managers presented a more confident view of chaplains than chaplains themselves held. Some chaplains expressed concern that effectiveness was hard to measure or not measured, but this was mostly not a concern for the managers. Chaplains were also a little more likely to pinpoint areas for improvement, and more likely to desire a greater level of influence and visibility for the chaplaincy. Managers were more content with the level of influence and visibility chaplains already held.

Even at the Christian-foundation Cathedrals Group university, where managers might be expected to seek a greater role for chaplaincy, the Pro-Vice Chancellor thought the right balance had been achieved between integrating chaplaincy into the university but not giving it too much prominence:
I think it’s quietly effective, and I think that’s quite right. I think that there’s a happy medium between it being overbearing and it being ineffective.

Overall, for managers and chaplains, the effectiveness of chaplaincy lay in its visibility through one or two excellent chaplains and its personal support for students (and sometimes staff). There was little discussion of chaplaincy’s impact on the university’s structures, suggesting that both constituencies view chaplaincy primarily as personal and relational.

**Students’ perspectives on the impact of chaplaincy**

**Chaplaincy users: frequent users, often socially marginalised**

A previous study of Christian students found that chaplaincy was important for a small minority of students: 8.7% of 2,233 Christian students responded ‘yes’ to the statement ‘chaplaincy or a chaplain has been central to my university experience’ (Guest et al. 2013: 138-145). This previous study revealed that very religiously committed students and marginalised students (especially international and ethnic-minority students) were more likely to see chaplaincy as central to their university experience. Two-thirds (67.2%) of the few students (61 out of 2233) who said they were regularly involved in chaplaincy activities, said that chaplaincy was central to their university experience, meaning that for the few (2.7%) who engage regularly with chaplaincy activities, chaplaincy is highly significant for them. The much larger proportion for whom it is central but who do not regularly attend chaplaincy activities are probably accessing chaplaincy on a more individual basis – attending services or seeing a chaplain for pastoral support (Aune 2016).

The survey of students for the current project set out to uncover more about students who use chaplaincy, why they do so, and what impact it has on their lives. Did the previous study’s findings hold for the students we surveyed for this project? Of the 188 student chaplaincy users who completed the survey, 84 were from the traditional elite university, 30 from the red brick, 49 from the 1960s campus, eight from the post-1992 university and 16 from the Cathedrals Group; one student did not specify their university. Response rates do not necessarily reflect the proportions of students engaged with chaplaincy in each university, as distribution methods varied to accommodate university preferences.

As Figure 6.1 shows, most students who completed the survey use chaplaincy regularly: only 23.4% use it once a term or less, and 58.0% use it at least once a week.

---

96. While this is a small proportion, the proportion of students who use chaplaincy at some point in their university lives (but do not see it as ‘central’) is likely to be higher.

97. Most universities did not agree to circulate an email solely about the survey, but combined it in an online newsletter. The larger response from the traditional elite university was probably because they sent students a direct email. While self-selection and uneven response rates mean these responses are not representative, they give an indication of the kinds of students who use chaplaincy and the kinds of experiences and impact that follow.
Chaplaincy is frequented particularly by students who are socially marginalised because of ethnicity and nationality. Our previous findings that the most religiously committed, and marginalised students, see chaplaincy as more important, are to some extent confirmed in this study. Whereas 24% of UK students came from an ethnic minority background in 2016-17\(^98\), 33.2% of our student chaplaincy users were non-white. While nationally 19% of university students were international,\(^99\) more than double this were from overseas in our sample: 47.6% of chaplaincy users were international (16% from the EU, 31.6% beyond the EU). International students outnumbered home students as chaplaincy users in the traditional elite and 1960s campus universities (where the proportion was highest at around two thirds),\(^100\) despite this latter university not having an unusually high proportion of international students overall.\(^101\) Chaplaincy also, in our study, attracted double the proportion of postgraduates: 24% of UK university students that year were postgraduates,\(^102\) but postgraduates made up 49% of those who answered our survey. In terms of gender and sexuality, the proportion of surveyed chaplaincy users who are non-heterosexual is higher than in the general student population, a finding that will challenge the assumption some might hold that religious spaces are not safe for LGBT students. Advance HE data (like the religion data, not available for all institutions) indicates that 65.6% of students affirm that they are heterosexual, 4.9% of students tick lesbian, gay, bisexual or ‘other’, while 29.6% do not answer the question. In contrast, in our survey, 74.6% ticked ‘heterosexual’, 12.4% ‘gay’, ‘lesbian’, ‘bisexual’ or ‘other’, 7.6% ticked ‘I’d rather not say’ and 5.4% ticked ‘I do not define my sexuality’.\(^103\) 56.7% of UK students are female (and 0.04% select ‘other’); in our sample 59% were female and 1.6% (three students) selected ‘other’.

Surveyed students in an ethnic minority group were more likely to use chaplaincy regularly.\(^104\) 86.9% of black and minority ethic students (including those of mixed ethnicity) used chaplaincy regularly compared to 73.2% of white students.\(^105\) Students belonging to minority religions used the chaplaincy more regularly (86.7%) than both Christians (79.0%) and those of no-religion (57.1%) (when ‘regular’ and ‘occasional’ use was compared), but due to small numbers of responses in the no-religion group a statistically significant relationship cannot be demonstrated.

How students use chaplaincy: religious services, pastoral support, group activities and personal spiritual practice

Students use chaplaincy for different activities, and for the students we surveyed, participating in a religious service was the most popular response, selected by 60.1% of students. This mirrors the data discussed in Chapter 2 on what chaplains aim to do. After this came five usages participated in by over a third of students: talking one-to-one with a chaplain; using the space for socialising; using the space for a religious society meeting; participating in a group activity organised by the chaplaincy; or using the space for prayer and spiritual reflection.

\(^98\). This includes the 1.6% of students who did not answer the question - https://www.hesa.ac.uk/news/11-01-2018/sfr247-higher-education-student-statistics/numbers

\(^99\). Including other EU countries https://www.hesa.ac.uk/news/11-01-2018/sfr247-higher-education-student-statistics/location

\(^100\). 64.4%

\(^101\). Conversely, the traditional elite university had an unusually high proportion of international students compared to other universities.


\(^104\). As the survey sample was small, it is not possible to report statistical significance for any demographics apart from ethnicity.

\(^105\). P= < 0.05.
While, as Figure 6.2 shows, a minority use chaplaincy for speaking with a chaplain as an intentional activity, asked if they had spoken to a chaplain on a one-to-one basis since being a student at that university, two-thirds (64.9%) said yes. About half of these students spoke to a chaplain at least monthly.

**Figure 6.2:** Students’ responses to the question ‘Which of the following describes your use of chaplaincy services or facilities? (tick as many as apply)’ (%)
Asked which description best applied to these one-to-one conversations, the largest number (45.2% of students) said it was ‘a conversation about life in general’. Next came ‘a conversation about my spiritual development’ and ‘a conversation about a personal problem I was having’ (both 27.2%).\(^{106}\) The importance of the chaplain being visible and available as a supportive presence, as highlighted by chaplains and managers, is clearly also important to students.

Asked: ‘Thinking of the one-to-one conversation with a chaplain that has been most significant for you, which of the following best describes that conversation?’ answers revealed that these significant conversations are often about the student themselves: their spiritual development, personal problems or ethical concerns. But the largest proportion were categorised as ‘about life in general’, suggesting that chaplaincy offers something beyond simply being a support or personal development service. Indeed, as their written responses reveal, as we will see shortly, chaplains are one of the few or only staff who are present for students with no particular agenda – they are not there as a lecturer to teach them so that they pass their course, an administrator organising their degree ceremony or a counsellor to help them work through a particular problem. Rather, they can give their time relatively unconditionally.

\(^{106}\) Students could select as many options as they wished, so percentages exceed 100.
The chaplains who have these meaningful conversations are almost always Christian – 110 (91.7%) of the 120 chaplains identified were Christian, with two Muslims, one Hindu, one Quaker named, alongside 3 ‘don’t knows’, one named as ‘inter-faith...though his training is Christian’ and two as ‘more than one chaplain’. This is probably because, as discussed in Chapter 1, Christian chaplains are more likely to work longer hours and be paid, meaning that when a student is in need, it is the Christians who are available, irrespective of the student’s religious identity. The fact that chaplains speak meaningfully with significant numbers of students whose primary purpose is not a one-to-one pastoral meeting, suggests that chaplains’ presence in a chaplaincy space is important, and that simply relying on occasional part-time chaplains to schedule appointments with students will not be sufficient to enable chaplains to create relationships with students. This confirms Chapter 2’s finding that being approachable was a characteristic students particularly value in chaplains.

Group activities for students

70.1% of students had taken part in a group activity organised by the chaplaincy other than a religious service, with 24.1% of students having done this frequently (more than ten times) and 33.7% having done so between two and ten times (the rest ticked ‘once’). Chaplaincy is, therefore, more than simply a port of call for students with pastoral concerns – it is also a place to socialise, pray and discuss religious and ethical issues. Asked what these activities were, students attended the most often, in this order: a social event (47.3% of students), a debate/discussion about religious issues (29.8%)\(^{107}\), a prayer meeting (29.3%), an inter-faith event (23.4%), a study or discussion of scripture/religious texts (21.8%), a discussion/debate about moral or ethical issues (21.3%), an excursion or outing to a place of interest away from the university (16.0%) or a music or arts-related event (12.8%), with ‘other’ constituting 5.3%. Those who ticked ‘other’ listed things such as an event for Holocaust Memorial Day, a Christian vocations discernment group, an English language class and a meal. 60.1% had taken part in collective prayer or worship organised by a university chaplain at least once, with the largest group having done so more than ten times.

\(^{107}\) It is interesting to note that students’ debates about religious issues take place in group settings, not in one-to-one conversations with chaplains.
Students’ descriptions of chaplaincy’s impact on them

As the image below demonstrates pictorially (the larger the word, the more often students mentioned it), students saw the chaplaincy as a ‘support’ that ‘helps’ their ‘university’ ‘experience’, a ‘place’, ‘space’ and ‘time’ they find ‘comforting’, that helps them ‘know’ and ‘feel’, and offers ‘religious’ ‘services’ and ‘prayer’ facilities.

Figure 6.5: How would you describe the impact of chaplaincy on your experience as a university student?

Chaplaincy as enhancing the university experience: the traditional elite university

In the traditional elite university, students’ responses were very positive. Chaplaincy was often equated with the lead Christian chaplain, for instance ‘He is a great listener and makes me feel very comfortable’ (no religion, home student), or ‘Our chaplain is a welcome leader in the university. While I have not personally used his services, I appreciate, and support his efforts to be Jesus for the students, regardless of their spiritual background. He has helped connect me to other [names faculty] faculty and staff that are Christians, which was much appreciated.’ (Christian, international student)

The theme of support came through strongly:

I think the chaplaincy has been a support for religious students and an encouragement to keep interacting with our faiths as well as exploring each other’s faiths. (Christian, international student)

Chaplaincy was described as enhancing students’ university experience:

The chaplaincy has greatly enhanced my experience as a student. Our Chaplain is one of the friendliest, kindest and most approachable people I know; he
always brightens your day, and it is such a comfort to know that he is there to listen if you ever need him. My university experience would not have been the same without him. (Christian, home student)

I would not have been able to have the university experience I was fortunate to have without the chaplaincy. (Jewish, EU student)

The chaplaincy has been an invaluable resource during my time as a student, particularly in my life outside study. (Christian, home student)

Chaplaincy provides a learning opportunity that differs from the purely academic focus of their courses:

It has helped me to relate my studies to practical aspects of life and made me feel connected to the wider university outside of my course. (Christian, home student)

Chaplaincy helps the students practise their faith on campus:

It is reassuring to know that there is a multi-faith chaplaincy available where I can go and pray during the day which is very important to me and helps me with my studies. (Muslim, EU student)

For international students it provides a social network and support:

It helped me and my family get to know other people here and from around the world. (no religion, international student)

Very helpful, especially in the first two years of my studies, as it is place where I did not feel judged for my result or language abilities, and where I always felt supported. (Christian, EU student)

Chaplaincy’s offering is distinct from that of other university departments, such as student services, welfare or counselling:

It’s so vitally important. Although we have student services, the chaplaincy offers a different type of advice and solace on a spiritual, more personal level. Knowing it is there and that I won’t be judged for whatever my views are on religion is a quiet relief and a unique, special element to the university used by students and staff alike. Very important. (Christian, home student)

The interesting thing… is that there is no one staff in the Student Service I can recall that has the personal charisma of the chaplain (you’re welcome [names chaplain]), and I can certainly feel that I can connect to the chaplain, but not anyone in the Student Service. (other religion, international student)

I personally found the conversations I had with the chaplain so much more helpful than any I have had with counsellors. I think this is because the chaplain engaged with me as a complete human being. We did not talk about religion (I am an atheist), but the chaplain is very wise. (no religion, home student)

Chaplaincy as a welcoming safe space: the red brick university

At the red brick university, students focused less on the individual chaplains and more on the opportunities created by the chaplaincy space. Where chaplains were described they were said to be ‘welcoming’ and ‘supportive’ (although one student had had a negative experience: ‘I was judged and made to feel like a bad person’ (religion withheld, home student), but mostly it was the environment that was described.

Chaplaincy as a place of welcome and friendship was an important theme, and the chaplaincy rooms were described as having a significant impact on the students’ wellbeing, for a wider community than just the religious:

I have been made to feel at home, and it has been encouraging to see that there are others who share the same faith as I do, and have similar experiences and struggles. Being a part of the chaplaincy has meant that I have made friends quite easily, which is often difficult when you come to university! (Christian, home student)

I love the idea that a unique space, such as the chaplaincy, has been created for students, and particularly for students who are of faith. However, this environment is never exclusive, nor comes across as excluding, to students who may not be of a faith based background. The atmosphere is always calming, inviting, and promotes an aura of peace and tranquillity, enabling study sessions to be comforting, and society meetings/activities to feel more engaging, impactful and familial. This has impacted my university experience. (Christian, home student)
It has allowed me to meet new friends and given me a place and time dedicated to socialising with them. It has allowed me to develop spiritually while at university. It has allowed me to share free meals with my congregation. It has allowed me to develop ‘soft skills’ through conversations and discussions about faith and religion. (Christian, home student)

Chaplaincy was described as welcoming for students marginalised because of being from a non-Christian religious group, or sexuality:

They have been incredibly welcoming, especially the Anglican Chaplaincy. As an LGBT Roman Catholic, they’ve been far more forthcoming in their acceptance of LGBT people like myself. (Christian, home student)

The chaplaincy space was also useful for hosting student religious society meetings:

I’d say it’s been useful to know I could go and talk to the Chaplain if needed, but I haven’t used that service. Mostly it’s been really useful to have [names rooms] to use for Christian Union prayer meeting, worship and small group meetups. (Christian, home student)

Chaplaincy as a source of spiritual and social support: the 1960s campus university

1960s campus students saw chaplaincy as a source of spiritual or religious support, enabling them to practice and grow in their faith:

It is essential to my religious growth as a student. (Christian, home student)

The Chaplaincy provides a space for spiritual grounding, which is crucial not only for education, but for life itself. (Christian, home student)

It helps me practice my faith and be in touch with persons that share it. (Christian, international student)

Chaplaincy gives social support:

The chaplaincy is the place where I first went when I got to uni and the people I met in the chaplaincy are the ones that I trust and have a close relationship with. (Christian, EU student)

Chaplaincy support had supported international students’ transition to the UK:

I participate in iCafe (Friends International) every [names a week day]. This service helps me to improve my English proficiency and to learn about cultural and religious things. (no religion, international student)

Comments on the chaplaincy enhancing students’ university experience were made here as well as in the traditional elite university:

Without the support of the chaplaincy, both chaplains and other groups, I don’t know how I would have coped. It has been central to my university experience. (Christian, home student)

Chaplaincy as impactful and effective: the post-1992 university

The few responses from students were brief and positive:

10/10. (Christian, international student)

Excellent. (Muslim, home student)

Having the space for spiritual beliefs has helped me to be more focused on my studies and life in general. (Muslim, home student)

The chaplaincy has had a huge impact on not only my student experience, but has and continues to play a vital role in my personal life. (Christian, home student)

Chaplaincy as a welcoming, safe space: the Cathedrals Group university

Students at the Cathedrals Group responded similarly to red brick students, seeing the space of the chaplaincy as welcoming and supportive:

It’s a lovely place to go to get away from the ‘university’ hustle and bustle. It’s a safe, comfortable happy place. (Christian, EU student)

As an international student, chaplaincy has been a great space to feel like home. (Christian, international student)
Chaplaincy has provided a safe space for students of all different backgrounds to be open to meeting new friends, forming relationships with chaplains and being comfortable to open up about your own faith, whilst meeting others who are doing the same. I personally use chaplaincy to chill with friends whilst in between lectures and seminars as the chaplains bring positive energy into the room. (Christian, home student)

The chaplaincy’s provision of food or eating facilities was mentioned by several:

Been very useful having access to the common room and kitchen facilities (religion withheld, home student)

The pastoral support given by chaplains was praised by a couple:

Very helpful and supportive during times when I felt very depressed. Also with other personal problems as well as spiritual development as a student. (Christian, home student)

One student who was studying on another campus of the university regretted the lack of chaplaincy space in that site:

The university I attend has a split site. Unfortunately there is no Chaplaincy presence at the campus I go to. The other campus has regular events and a significant presence. I feel left out! I commute to uni and it is not easy for me to get to the other campus. The impact of the Chaplaincy on me in virtually non-existent, although I would like to be more involved, there is no provision at my campus. (Christian, home student)

How chaplaincy impacts other students: students’ observations

When asked to describe the impact of chaplaincy on other students, some were unsure.

I wouldn’t know, but the Christians seem happy with the chaplaincy as do the Muslims and Jewish students. It fills a role and would leave a horrible, meaningless vacuum were the chaplaincy not there. (other religion, home student, traditional elite)

Many commented that the majority of students don’t use chaplaincy.

99% of them don’t know it’s there and wouldn’t care if they did. (Christian, home student, red brick)

Not a lot of my associates talk about the chaplaincy or its effects (no religion, home student, Cathedrals Group)

I think most students don’t use the Chaplaincy as there are many other buildings they can use for meetings and study spaces. (Christian, home student, traditional elite)

A couple commented that the chaplaincy has a quiet impact on students, as students benefit from its services without necessarily recognising them as ‘chaplaincy’:

Whilst many students might not be impacted by the chaplaincy, there are many events in which it is not known that the chaplaincy organises them. It isn’t all about religious events, although there should be focus on that too. (Jewish, EU student, traditional elite)

Nevertheless, students thought that chaplaincy is seen as a positive and welcoming space:

The chaplaincy allows us to have a safe space of tolerance to discuss our religious views. (Christian, international student, traditional elite)

I have no idea about religious things. However, I suppose that chaplaincy is helpful for not only Christian students but also other students in terms of inter-cultural understanding. (non-religious, international student, 1960s campus)

Overall, the general view was that most students did not use chaplaincy, but those who did experienced a large and positive impact:

I think it only impacts people who go looking for it, but it fills a very real void in students’ lives. (Christian, international student, traditional elite)

Most don’t know it exists, those that do have the freedom to develop relationships they otherwise wouldn’t have, meet people they would never have otherwise met, and grow in ways they never expected. (Christian, home student, red brick)
Students’ views on the role of chaplaincy in universities

The high level of positive responses from students was supported via positive responses to statements where they were asked their opinion about various aspects of chaplaincy. 85.5% agreed that ‘I am satisfied with the chaplaincy at my university’. Students who use chaplaincy see it as being satisfactorily resourced, but not given sufficient recognition by the wider university. Students think that their university should prioritise chaplaincy in its funding plans, and agree that chaplains perform an essential role.

Students who use chaplaincy think it provides a highly valuable welfare service, complementary to and distinct from student services or student welfare, as discussed in Chapter 2. 85.5% agreed that ‘Chaplaincy at my university is an important welfare service for students’. They also think chaplaincy should not just be for religious students, but that chaplains should serve the needs of all students and should make building of good relations between students of different faiths a core focus. Religion should not be confined to the chaplaincy, they believe; however, non-religious students were more likely than religious students to tick ‘agree’ to ‘religion should be something that happens in the chaplaincy, but not anywhere else on campus’ — 28.6% did so, compared to 9.6% of Christians and 10.0% of other religions.

Figure 6.6: Students’ views on university/chaplaincy relations (%)

Students who use chaplaincy think it provides a highly valuable welfare service, complementary to and distinct from student services or student welfare, as discussed in Chapter 2. 85.5% agreed that ‘Chaplaincy at my university is an important welfare service for students’. They also think chaplaincy should not just be for religious students, but that chaplains should serve the needs of all students and should make building of good relations between students of different faiths a core focus. Religion should not be confined to the chaplaincy, they believe; however, non-religious students were more likely than religious students to tick ‘agree’ to ‘religion should be something that happens in the chaplaincy, but not anywhere else on campus’ — 28.6% did so, compared to 9.6% of Christians and 10.0% of other religions.
Summary: the positive impact of chaplaincy on students

Overall, chaplaincy has a very positive impact on students who use it. The physical space of the chaplaincy is crucial, and in each of the five universities were dedicated chaplaincy facilities which students benefitted from using. Chaplaincies provided a welcoming and safe space for spiritual growth and making friends, meaningful conversations with chaplains, and enhanced students’ university experiences.

Managers and chaplains view chaplaincy as effective when it is visible, embodied in an impactful individual and when it offers personal support to students. Students concur, valuing its relational nature, the conversations (pastoral and general) they have with chaplains, as well as the activities, social and religious, they take part in with and in the chaplaincy. But students also value the physical space of chaplaincy – its ability to offer a welcome safe space for them. Chaplaincy, for them, is not just the person of the chaplain – it is also the space of the chaplaincy. Chaplains and managers should not ignore the importance of good physical space for chaplaincy, and this requires resourcing, to ensure the space is adequate for chaplains’ and students’ needs.

Should chaplains’ impact be measured? Religious organisations’ perspectives

This study seeks to start to do what is often not done systematically – to record the impact of university chaplaincy. That this task is rarely undertaken was underscored by the religion and belief organisations when asked ‘Do you seek to measure the impact of your chaplains? If so, how?’ None of the local organisations record impact systematically, although a few people gave examples of it having been either: attempted some years ago in a previous piece of national research (Roman Catholic Bishops representative, Cathedrals Group), recommended to chaplains that they do it in a self-devised way (Anglican leader, 1960s campus), or discussed in meetings through sharing anonymous stories of a chaplain’s impact on an individual (Anglican chaplain, red brick; Anglican bishop, 1960s campus; Workplace Chaplaincy Group Chair, 1960s campus). Some thought it would be a good idea to record impact but did not know how to. The Cathedrals Group Anglican bishop said:

Figure 6.7: Students’ views on the place and role of chaplaincy (%)

I am satisfied with the chaplaincy at my university

Within universities, religion should be something that happens in the chaplaincy, but not anywhere else on campus

All chaplains should serve the needs of the entire student body, irrespective of any student’s personal faith tradition

At the heart of chaplaincy work is the building of positive relations between students of different faiths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
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[Figure 6.7: Students’ views on the place and role of chaplaincy (%)]

- I am satisfied with the chaplaincy at my university
- Within universities, religion should be something that happens in the chaplaincy, but not anywhere else on campus
- All chaplains should serve the needs of the entire student body, irrespective of any student’s personal faith tradition
- At the heart of chaplaincy work is the building of positive relations between students of different faiths
With the two chaplains who are more technically part of our church in the other universities, there are 40,000 students and two chaplains, so you’re not looking for community transformation in any visible sense. And, as someone said to me when I was a chaplain, many years ago, when there were many more chaplains, they said to me that this can only ever be a token ministry and therefore your task is to find out whether the token you are providing is the right token. And that I think…I’m content with my colleagues who are doing the chaplaincy in the city, and that’s what they are trying to do, but I’m still stumped as to how you can produce a metric which would carry over time.

The national religious organisations gave similar answers, and some showed greater enthusiasm for measuring impact. Only one organisation, University Jewish Chaplaincy, said that they kept records, for auditors, of numbers of people receiving hospitality from chaplains in their homes (e.g. through attending Shabbat dinners) or attending events. The Buddhist representative said that some chaplains kept records of numbers of university members signing up for mindfulness courses run by Buddhist chaplains, but these were not held nationally. The Roman Catholic organisation had consulted several dozen chaplains in order to write a descriptive report about Catholic chaplaincy, and the Methodist said that chaplains report on their work to their local committee but share only qualitative information. Both the Church of England and the Colleges and Universities of the Anglican Communion representatives expressed a desire to systematically measure impact. For example:

The short version is, not yet. And the reason for that is lots of chaplains are finding difficulty doing that themselves. So a better analysis of chaplaincy impact assumes a number of things, one of which is that chaplains themselves are engaged in that process. Now I want to caveat that, I don’t think chaplains are uninterested and not bothered about the question of the impact they make. I think they’re often too modest about the impact they make and not all chaplains have got beyond a descriptive approach to impact…

The next stage for us at a national level is to say, how can we begin to collate that, so that we can say, ‘We judge that the impact of Anglican chaplaincy in our universities looks like this’. (Church of England national representative)

Established organisations – the major Christian denominations and University Jewish Chaplaincy – are in a better position to document impact, and although the Muslim, Sikh and Hindu representatives were recognised in their religious communities as skilled in chaplaincy and ran related organisations, they did not run an organisation dedicated to higher education or chaplaincy, so it would be hard, if not impossible, to collate impact. Humanists UK are responsible for chaplains, but there are as yet too few for any systematic data to be collected.

Capturing impact and effectiveness via telephone interviews with chaplains

The telephone interviews with chaplains revealed that chaplains have an impact on their universities on several levels – on an individual student, a group of staff or students, or the whole university’s culture or organisational structure. Recording of impact (for example, numbers of students chaplains see) is not systematic. University chaplaincy differs from healthcare and prison chaplaincy, where statistics-keeping is more common, and where, as Clines (2015: 290) points out, ‘it is reasonable to surmise that the functions and duties of an education chaplain are likely to be, on average, less prescriptive than those of chaplains in prison, military or health care settings. This is because these other settings have more specific and prescriptive functions in their organisational purpose when compared to learning institutions’. The approach to recording impact varies widely, with most chaplains not, or only partially, recording impact. Only 14.8% answered ‘yes’ when asked ‘Do you record impact?’ 37.3% said ‘to some extent’ and 47.9% said ‘no’. Those who paid were twice as likely to record impact as volunteers. 108 Chaplains recording impact were asked how they do so. Annual reports were common, submitted to university managers or committees or to the chaplain’s external religious group. Sometimes there were termly or occasionally weekly reports recording numbers of students seen by chaplains. Some chaplains provide statistical data such as numbers of people attending events or religious services. Some asked chaplaincy users to complete evaluation forms after a chaplaincy event, or a question on chaplaincy was included in a university’s student satisfaction survey.

108. P= <0.001. 19.5% of paid chaplains said ‘yes’, 41.9% said ‘to some extent’ and 38.6% said ‘no’; the numbers for volunteers were 8.0% (yes), 30.7% (to some extent) and 61.3% (no).
Categories developed in Theos’s project *Chaplaincy: A very modern ministry* (Ryan 2015) were adapted for this project; we asked ‘In the last 12 months, have you seen evidence of any of the following four types of impact as a consequence of the work of your university chaplaincy?’ These are four levels of impact, moving from the individual to the structural.109

---

**Figure 6.8:** Proportion of chaplains reporting their work as having an identifiable impact on the life of their university during the previous 12 months, broken down into forms of impact (%)

Three-quarters of chaplains noted impact on individual student ‘service users’ (explained using the example of a student recovering from a mental health crisis after support from chaplain). Many recounted examples of students helped with different aspects of their lives. A Christian traditional elite chaplain said: ‘The greatest impact has been in supporting students in mental health crises, and seeing them cope with life/studies’, while a post-1992 university Christian chaplain explained: ‘I’ve seen students come through difficult situations by getting support. There’s a cafe for international students. 60 students attend and many say how much they value it given the pressure they face with study demands.’

Two-thirds noted an impact on the atmosphere or sense of community. The Carol Service was mentioned by a red brick Christian chaplain, who said ‘We have a lot of staff and students who come to the Carol Service and this is a positive impact, as on the last day of the semester, rather than going home, they took time to join in the festival.’ A Christian chaplain had been running a women’s inter-faith group and said that ‘as a result the community has grown and fostered a sense of belonging’ (1960s campus).

---

109. We are aware of the multiple problems of measuring ‘impact’ and the relations of power that it implies. But short of any more adequate means of gauging what difference chaplaincy makes within universities, and mindful of its limitations, we offer a discussion of reports of impact as a way into this issue.
As for impact at whole-university level, half noted evidence of increased organisational support or buy-in. A Christian chaplain at a post-1992 university said they had received student services funding for a chaplaincy coordinator post. At another post-1992 university, senior management asked chaplaincy what they needed, and supported the chaplaincy’s relocation to provide better facilities. ‘Chaplaincy work has been more publicly acknowledged by the university’, the Christian chaplain said.

47% noted a change in organisational practice in the university, for instance a chaplain’s advice leading to the production of new university policy or training on religion and belief. For example, a red brick Christian chaplain drew up a response to global tragedies with senior management to help the university to think about how it responds. A Sikh traditional elite chaplain had worked with the university to produce a policy saying that Sikh students and staff could wear the kirpan (ceremonial dagger, one of the 5Ks Khalsa Sikhs wear) on campus.

Examples of chaplaincy impact

Impact on service users:
A number of students have come with a particular anxiety and being in contact with a chaplain either once or over a period of time, students have found a way to move forward. Help and support for staff who are facing a change of role, new jobs, bereavement, and the Chaplain has helped staff overcome these problems. (Christian chaplain, 1960s campus)

Change of atmosphere or sense of community
We started a student night on campus every Friday 18 months ago. It provides an alternative instead of going into town so students can experience community-based activities rather than alcohol-based activities. Upwards of 50 people attend every week. Also hold a weekly lunch. This has developed into a central event in the university calendar. International students come which certainly builds community. The lunch celebrates festivals and is very vibrant. (Christian chaplain, Cathedrals Group)

Evidence of increased organisational support or buy-in
Religious Literacy training, review of Religion and Belief Policy, campus planning, resolving conflict through pastoral care, commitment to funding for enhanced support. (Christian chaplain, post-1992)

Advocated for improved facilities for Muslims (Prayer Space) which has been upgraded at two campuses. (Christian chaplain, red brick)

Change in organisational practice
Helping re-write Student Death Policy. Involved with advising on the University’s policy on Religion and Belief and with Student Services on Well-Being. Invited to comment on the university’s court membership - that is a body of local stakeholders in the community. (Christian chaplain, red brick)
These reports of impact demonstrate the significant role chaplains believe they are playing in their universities. But some chaplains have or see greater impact than others. Those who report seeing most impact are paid and work full time. As Table 6.1 shows, the more hours chaplains work, the more impact they observe; this is logical, as the more hours they work, the more time and opportunity they have to observe impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on service users</th>
<th>Over 30 hours a week (N = 128)</th>
<th>5-30 hours a week (N = 119)</th>
<th>Occasionally or below 5 hours a week (N = 119)</th>
<th>Overall (N = 366)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on service users</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of atmosphere or sense of community</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased organisational support or buy-in</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in organisational practice</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: % of chaplains reporting having seen evidence of each type of impact in the past 12 months, by the chaplain’s working hours

Chaplains who are paid also observe more impact than volunteers, as the table below shows. This increased impact observed or experienced is evident in every type of impact, with the greatest difference at the two whole-university levels. This is probably because paid chaplains are more embedded within the institution, so more able to have and see impact beyond what happens within the chaplaincy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on service users</th>
<th>Paid (N = 215)</th>
<th>Volunteers (N = 151)</th>
<th>Overall (366 people)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on service users</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of atmosphere or sense of community</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased organisational support or buy-in</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in organisational practice</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: % of chaplains reporting having seen evidence of each type of impact in the past 12 months, with paid chaplains compared with volunteers

110. The ‘In the last 12 months...’ question enquired into observed change as a result of the chaplaincy (rather than as a result of them as individual chaplains), but it is probable that the chaplain would be most aware of his or her own chaplaincy impact, so it is likely that they are commenting on the work of the chaplaincy as a unit or space, their chaplaincy colleagues’ work and their own work.

111. All significant at p = < 0.001

112. Significant at p = < 0.001
Whether being part time or being paid makes the greater difference to observing or having impact is not possible to fully assess. But comparing those working 5-30 hours shows that those who are paid observe more impact than those who are volunteers, even when they are working the same hours, in three of the four impact categories. However, without knowing the number of hours each worked, it is impossible to say for certain, since it might be that those who are paid are working a large number of hours (e.g. 20), whereas those who are volunteers are working fewer (e.g. six).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>5-30 hours a week (PAID) (N = 68)</th>
<th>5-30 hours a week (VOLUNTEER) (N = 51)</th>
<th>Overall (367 people)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on service users</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of atmosphere or sense of community</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased organisational support or buy-in</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in organisational practice</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6.3: % of chaplains working 5-30 hours reporting having seen evidence of each type of impact in the past 12 months*\(^{14}\)

The implication of this is that chaplains will see more impact when they are paid and full-time, which means that if organisations want to increase the likelihood that chaplains will see and have an impact, they should, arguably, pay them and increase their working hours. For religious bodies wondering if it is better to pay fewer chaplains to have strategic impact on a few institutions, or to employ a larger number for fewer hours to provide a wider presence in more institutions, the data suggest that employing smaller numbers of people to work higher numbers of hours in particular institutions might produce greater impact overall.

Who pays chaplains also affects the impact they observe or have. As Table 6.4 shows, when the university pays the salary or pays it jointly with a religious organisation, the chaplain sees more impact in each impact type than if they are funded by a religious body or not funded at all. This is probably because when a chaplain is paid by the university, they have more official recognition, better relationships with senior managers and improved capacity to make change.

---

113. As all but two chaplains working over 30 hours are paid, it is not possible to compare the paid versus voluntary ‘full-timers’, and neither is it possible statistically to compare those working below 5 hours a week, since only ten of them are paid. Because we did not ask chaplains to say exactly how many hours a week they worked, we cannot arrive at an exact answer to whether being paid or working longer hours makes the greater difference in whether they observe impact; we can simply say that both seem to make a difference.

114. Significant at \(p < 0.001\).
Overall, the information provided by the 367 chaplains shows that chaplains are having an impact, and that the greatest impacts seem to occur when chaplains work longer hours, are paid, and are paid by the university. Enabling chaplains to achieve maximum impact in universities requires, therefore, financial investment by universities. If chaplains remain as volunteers and part-timers, the impact they can achieve will be limited.

Bringing this together with the face-to-face interviews with chaplains, managers and religious organisations, and the survey of students, there are further implications. Chaplaincy is about the person of the chaplain and about the physical space of the chaplaincy. To ensure excellent chaplaincy, chaplains need to be supported in their work (through university endorsement and resources), training (via universities and religious organisations chaplains are linked to), pay, full-time or near full-time hours and good working conditions. Chaplaincy requires good physical space: rooms that different religious groups can use for prayer, worship or reflection, socialising, holding meetings and pastoral appointments with chaplains.

In the move to professionalise university chaplaincy – already underway through, for instance, chaplaincy courses and the integration of chaplaincy into universities’ student services departments – recording impact should be seen as an important step. This report may be taken as a first attempt to record impact across the whole university sector, and builds upon Ryan’s (2015) helpful cross-sector chaplaincy report.

Recording impact, while identified by some as a bureaucratic burden on busy staff (particularly volunteers), has benefits in demonstrating the utility of the chaplaincy role. Ryan’s (2015) report’s section on impact, which suggests the collecting of a basic level of evidence both quantitatively and qualitatively, gives a useful steer and explains the reasons why recording impact is important:

For the organisation in which the chaplain sits, having a more robust impact assessment can help them evaluate how things are going, how resources are being used and how they can better support a valuable service. For a faith and belief group, chaplains present a huge opportunity for engagement in the public square, and a significant potential asset, but one that often seems tangential to the central mission

---

Table 6.4: % of chaplains reporting having seen evidence of each type of impact in the past 12 months, by source of funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on service users</th>
<th>Paid by university or by university jointly with a religious body (N = 107)</th>
<th>Paid by a religious body (N = 101)</th>
<th>Paid (other funding arrangement) (N = 7)</th>
<th>Volunteer (n = 151)</th>
<th>Overall (N = 366)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on service users</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of atmosphere or sense of community</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased organisational support or buy-in</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in organisational practice</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

115. As few people had another funding arrangement, the figures in this column are not reliable enough to draw conclusions. Overall, figures are significant at p = < 0.001
of these groups. A better appreciation of impact might awaken a greater interest in this ministry and highlight to faith and belief groups what chaplaincy can provide – as well as allowing them to check what chaplains are doing in their name.

It is also simply a matter of doing due diligence. There are wonderful stories of what chaplains are doing, but it would be naïve and dangerous to assume that, therefore, there is no need for proper assessment and accountability. The stakes for chaplaincy are potentially quite high – success serves as a powerful ministry that can deliver huge benefits to service users and make a strong case for the position of faith and belief groups in the public square. If done badly, however, chaplaincy as a whole could suffer a loss of reputation and deprive both those who rely on the services, organisations as a whole and the faith and belief groups from which chaplains come, from receiving any of these benefits. It is not sustainable to fail to collect evidence of impact, or to assume that a lack of accountability, however desirable that freedom may seem, does not pose a threat to the chaplaincy model. (Ryan 2015: 67)

The question of how best to record meaningful impact is an urgent and important one, but also one that eludes easy solution. Resistance to recording simple quantitative measures might be because it is perceived as a bureaucratic burden on busy staff (particularly volunteers). But it may go deeper. It might be because chaplains understand themselves to be witnesses of something that is qualitatively different to the language of utility employed in universities, witnesses that speak for another world where gift comes before performance, where a person’s ultimate value cannot be reduced to measurable achievement. Nevertheless, if chaplains are to receive the recognition that this research indicates they are due, a way has to be found to offer an account of their contribution that others can appreciate, yet that does not contradict the very values that make them distinctive and of worth. High quality narrative descriptions of the difference chaplains are making, which escape translation into straightforward metrics, commend themselves as the best route to take through tricky terrain. This is precisely what this research has sought to provide, uniquely at a sector-wide level.

Chaplains and chaplaincies have a significant impact on universities. It is time to document this more systematically to ensure that university chaplaincy’s achievements are recognised and it receives the resources it needs to function well.
Chapter 7: Summary of findings

This report builds on the important work of Jeremy Clines, published a decade ago, and scholars including Ataullah Siddiqui and Sophie Gilliat-Ray, whose work has allowed us to measure changes in the provision of university chaplaincy over recent years. It also provides an in-depth view through case studies of five universities, involving interviews with chaplains, university managers, religion and belief organisations, and a survey of students. Reflecting a UK context in which chaplains are increasingly seen as important agents in the delivery of government agendas (for instance supporting equality and diversity), Chapter 1 finds that while around six in ten chaplains are Christian, chaplaincy provision is becoming more diverse, better reflecting the UK’s religious diversity. Chaplaincy is moving to a multi-faith model, but it has not yet arrived. While perhaps as many as two-thirds of chaplains are volunteers, the majority of chaplaincy time is funded, there being many volunteers who offer a small number of hours regularly, or who are involved occasionally only. The average UK university has 10.4 chaplains: 3.8 paid and 6.6 volunteers. The time they offer equates to 3.3 full-time equivalent (FTE) roles, with 2.4 FTE of chaplain time being paid and 0.9 given voluntarily. Christians hold the majority of paid chaplaincy roles; these roles being connected to historical arrangements between universities and the Anglican (and sometimes Roman Catholic and Methodist) local authorities. Muslim chaplains are beginning to be paid by universities, and Jewish chaplains are often paid by the organisation University Jewish Chaplaincy. Beyond the monotheistic faiths, chaplains receive virtually no remuneration. Moreover, we estimate that across the 144 major universities, the time chaplains give voluntarily constitutes around £4.5 million of volunteer labour each year – a significant gift to universities by religion and belief groups. Volunteers add value to chaplaincy work, but there is a tension, discussed throughout the report, between what can be delivered by full-time, paid chaplains versus part-time volunteers. The former are generally well-connected to (but occasionally constrained by) university student services departments, with good relationships with university managers. The latter provide their time as a gift and expect to be able to offer the critical wisdom of an external observer, but yet are often unavailable. This is a tension needing reflection and resolution, by universities and religion and belief organisations.

One in five university chaplaincies are called ‘multi-faith’ chaplaincies or centres, up from one in ten in 2007. This reflects universities’ increasing desire to meet the religious needs of students from diverse religious backgrounds, perhaps in response to the Equality Act 2010, which treats religion or belief as an equality issue and ‘protected characteristic’ equal to gender, ethnicity, disability and others. Chaplains are becoming more religiously diverse, reflecting the increasing religious diversity of the student population. This was noted in Clines’ 2007 study, and it is more so today. In the ten years since Clines’ study, there has been a rise in the proportion of chaplains who are Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu, Baha’i, as well as a significant rise in numbers who are humanist, inter-faith, or Pagan. The Christian proportion has fallen from 70% to around 60%.116

These changes inevitably raise the question of whether chaplaincy should be multi-faith or single-religion? There are some tensions or differences in how universities and chaplains view the notion of ‘multi-faith’ chaplaincy. Multi-faith is sometimes a term favoured by university managers charged with prioritising equality and diversity as a way of signalling an inclusive campus. A ‘multi-faith’ centre is viewed by managers as somewhere many or all faiths are welcome. But the reality of chaplaincy is that although most chaplaincy teams comprise members of several different religions, as well as several different Christian denominations, Christians do the lion’s share of chaplaincy work and are much more likely to be paid and work full-time. Christian (most often Anglican) chaplains often lead multi-faith chaplaincy teams, but this does not mean they are ‘multi-faith chaplains’. While most chaplains are committed to inter-faith and multi-faith work, they are also committed to representing their own religious organisation; they wish to do (and are charged by their religious organisation with doing) ‘Jewish chaplaincy’, ‘Sikh chaplaincy’ or ‘Roman Catholic chaplaincy’. They are not commissioned by their religion or belief body as a ‘multi-faith chaplain’. Balancing these two realities clearly demands careful thought and consultation.

Chapter 2 reveals that one third of chaplains see their primary aim as pastoral (supporting students, often on a one-to-one basis to promote their wellbeing and address challenges and problems), while one sixth see it as religious (facilitating

116. The proportion of Christian chaplains in 2017 was 59% (if Quakers are not included within the label ‘Christian’), or 63% (if Quakers are included). To enable comparison with Clines’ study which subsumed ‘Quaker’ under ‘Christian’, we cite both figures. Quakers are increasingly eschewing being identified as Christian. Figures from a longitudinal study of British Quakers demonstrate a declining proportion identify as Christian, from 51.5% in 1990, to 45.5% in 2003, to 36.5% in 2013 (Dandelion, forthcoming).
religious understanding and practice). For non-Christian chaplains and university managers, these two roles dominate their understanding of the purpose of chaplaincy. Christian chaplains, however, embrace a range of other aims including those of presence (the gift of availability) and mission (witnessing to the love of God). These latter two aims are, significantly, the most popular choices amongst chaplains of Cathedrals Group universities. Further distinguishing the Cathedrals Group universities from all other types, it is here that Christian chaplains are most likely to embrace explicitly Christian language when expressing their primary aim. Yet even in the Cathedrals Group, and markedly so elsewhere, a majority of chaplains elect to use generic ‘secular’ language, with not a single non-Christian chaplain deploying a belief idiom to describe their primary aim. These combined results generate the hypothesis that chaplains are experiencing a pressure to conform to the perceived expectations of university managers who are likely to understand the language of student support but not the language of theology and belief.

Student descriptions of the contribution chaplains make confirms that what chaplains intend to deliver is experienced as achieved. Students particularly appreciate chaplains who are approachable and non-judgemental in their attitude (notably those in Student Union positions).

University managers and students both agree that chaplaincy provides something unique that cannot be replicated elsewhere in a university. However, the former have little or no conception that chaplaincy might include a prophetic or a missional role. Neither do they appreciate, unlike the students who use chaplaincy services, that maintaining integrity of faith while serving the university is a live issue for chaplains and the religious ‘sponsors’ of chaplaincy. We observe that managers tend to see chaplains from the ‘outside’ as those who can deliver certain outcomes, rather than from the ‘inside’ as people who wrestle with questions of motivation and identity. To counteract this tendency, we unfold some of the theological models chaplains from across the religion and belief spectrum use to guide their work.

Chapter 3 demonstrates that who chaplains work with, and what they do in practice, reflects fairly well their aims as described above. Their aims are expressed through pastoral activities such as one-to-one support and counselling for students and staff, and by religious activities such as conducting religious services and running inter-faith events. They spend much time on administration, and a very significant amount of time fulfilling their aim of ‘presence’, through building a sense of community in the chaplaincy and wider university. ‘Being there’ is manifested in such things as running weekly lunches and being available to ‘chat’ over a cup of tea with whoever might come into the chaplaincy space. ‘Being there’ and offering hospitality seemed almost to depend on having a chaplaincy space to welcome students and staff to, a space that they crafted to be a welcoming environment for all who might enter. Chaplains work first and foremost with students of their own religious tradition, supporting religious student societies, running spiritual development activities such as religious discussion groups or meditation, but they work with other student groups too, particularly with non-religious students, international students and students of a range of faith and belief positions. For international students this might involve English language support or trips out to places of interest, while for non-religious students it might involve providing a listening ear. With staff, chaplains work both in a pastoral capacity, and alongside them as colleagues in the student welfare support structure, staff managed by a senior member of student services or fellow members of, for instance, university equality and diversity committees. Religious services chaplains run on campus bring their student and staff constituencies together. Christian chaplains work with a wider range of people than non-Christian chaplains; the latter tend to focus primarily, in their limited chaplaincy time, on working with students from their own faith tradition, creating a bridge also to local religious communities.

These experiences are framed by the institutional diversity of the UK higher education sector, and just as there are patterns in the way in which religion is accommodated within different university ‘types’ (Guest et al 2013), so there are also patterns in how chaplaincy work is facilitated and managed. The most abundant space for prayer and worship for students (calculated using a students-to-spaces ratio) is at Cathedrals Group universities, followed by traditional elites, 1960s campuses, and post-1992 universities, with red bricks having the smallest amount. A collective act of Christian worship takes place in 80.8% of universities on a weekly basis, mostly organised by the chaplaincy, with no major differences between types of university. More variation exists for Muslim Friday prayers: these happen in three-quarters of universities, but much less in Cathedrals Group universities (they happen in only 40.0%, compared to 94.4% of 1960s campuses, 84.6% of traditional elites, 76.3% of post-1992 universities and 71.4% of red bricks). This mirrors the ambiguous status of Cathedrals Group universities, which appear to have the best resourced and most institutionally embedded chaplaincy services, but serve the needs of Christian students far better than non-Christians.

Chapter 4 shows that chaplains relate to their universities in a variety of ways, and these are shaped most significantly by
available resources (time, people and money), the nature of relationships with other staff, the infrastructure of collaboration set in place, and the shared ethos of the institution (if it has something identifiable as one). Chaplains engage with academic departments to varying degrees depending largely on individual relationships and common points of intellectual interest, but this is often uneven and unstructured. Chaplains’ involvement in university governance appears to have received renewed momentum on account of recent legislation, especially concerning equality and diversity and counter-terrorism. These oblige universities to attend to human complexities about which chaplains are often thought to have expertise or skill, either in terms of religious literacy or pastoral sensitivity, and so highlight new areas of relevance for the chaplain. Student support departments offer more potential for collaboration, given a common focus on student welfare. An emerging pattern is of chaplaincy treated as an overflow service for oversubscribed professional support departments, although its success depends on adequate resourcing, communication and trust between parties. None are guaranteed, and the heavy reliance on volunteer labour presents challenges in striking a balance between retaining the good will of non-contractual chaplains and retaining appropriate systems of accountability and quality control that are the preoccupation of university managers. Unsurprisingly, then, the case studies with the most functional and apparently successful patterns of collaboration involved a full-time paid chaplain who was well integrated and respected across their institution.

Managers and chaplains sometimes have different visions for what chaplaincy ought to be about, and these can mask deeper agendas, e.g. the application of ‘Anglican’ and ‘multi-faith’ labels to chaplaincy in the same institution can reveal embedded institutional relationships and funding, but be experienced as Christian hegemony; ‘multi-faith’ can be a cypher for ‘inclusive’, favoured by managers charged with prioritising values of equality and diversity, but be alienating for Christian chaplains when they have invested most in chaplaincy work. Nevertheless, most chaplains and managers view their universities as ‘friendly to faith’ and the majority of chaplains are satisfied with the level of support they receive from university management. While some recall past times when there was more hostility or scepticism, the majority appear to function in environments in which chaplaincy is recognised as having a legitimate and valuable role to play. How this is expressed in practical terms varies hugely, and our comparison of university types confirms that institutional identity and levels of investment (both finance and trust in key individuals) matters a great deal. Most strikingly, the wider institutional embeddedness of chaplaincy pays significant dividends within the traditional-elite, post-1992 university and Cathedrals Group case studies that are noticeably absent from the red brick and 1960s campus universities. The more avowedly secular foundations of the latter two appear relevant in informing enduring perspectives among staff, but more important are matters of governance and lack of investment. It is also worth noting that the explicitly Christian ethos of the Cathedrals Group university manages to bind staff together in a common project, but this is to some extent frustrated by an overly complex accountability structure which lacks singular leadership. The two lead chaplains at the traditional elite and post-1992 universities appear to thrive in part because they are given autonomy to lead on account of them being trusted by the broader university management. Much can be learned from their example.

Chapter 5 finds that most university chaplains are happy with the support they receive from their own religion or belief organisation, although arrangements of recognition and training seem to make a difference. In particular, those not officially recognised as representing their tradition or organisation are significantly less satisfied with the support they receive from it. It is unclear whether this a matter of orthodoxy (e.g. some chaplains viewed as heterodox by their own tradition’s standards are denied recognition and support), structures of governance (e.g. some traditions not having systems of support or official recognition within certain regions), or simply communication (e.g. communities and their leaders not knowing that a chaplain has been appointed to represent them). Actual engagement with local organisations appears most effective and enduring when built on well-developed relationships, including inter-faith initiatives for which this is essential. For many chaplains, though, this relationship is primarily one of endorsement and/or informal support; legitimacy of this kind can help build links with local churches, synagogues and mosques, but only when backed up by energy and enthusiasm for building links between campus and community. When this is effectively tapped and mobilised – e.g. by Friends International – it appears to provide a service valued equally by both.

At a national level, the support received by university chaplains from their own respective traditions varies significantly, with the most developed and extensive available via the established Church of England and the least developed evident among the smaller minority faiths. Some of the latter have begun to emulate Christian models of chaplaincy in order to establish appropriately robust support structures for chaplaincy within their own traditions that are recognised within the broader context, reflecting how profoundly university chaplaincy is shaped by the distinctive circumstances of the British setting. The case of Humanists UK reveals how equality legislation and its influence on the life of public institutions can be mobilised to reinforce the status
of chaplaincy when the cultural and financial capital is available to its advocates. This legislation highlights possible new areas of relevance for chaplains, as does the counter-terrorism Prevent strategy. Our case studies reveal how, often unlike their funding organisations, some chaplains have been strategic in their engagement with new national policy agendas, so that responses at the local level have included creative initiatives that sometimes enhance chaplaincy provision.

Measuring the impact of chaplaincy is challenging and is explored in Chapter 6. While it may be desirable for a number of constituencies involved in chaplaincy, it is not yet done in a systematic way by most chaplains, nor is it often demanded by managers in universities or religion and belief organisations. When students and university managers and chaplains are asked how effective chaplaincy is in their university, most are very positive, with managers more positive than the (perhaps more modest) chaplains. But effectiveness is often articulated in terms of things that would be hard to measure quantitatively: the importance of chaplains being visible on campus; the need for at least one or two very visible and active chaplains. Effectiveness is highly dependent on time available for chaplaincy work, and the current extent of chaplaincy provision makes it challenging to sustain both chaplaincy visibility (for example, walking around the campus with time to stop to talk with whoever is encountered), alongside a lot of one-to-one pastoral support in the chaplaincy offices.

By asking 367 chaplains whether they had observed certain kinds of impact in the last twelve months, we have captured an encouraging level of impact: three-quarters of chaplains reported impact on individual students, two-thirds reported changes in atmosphere or sense of community, while around a half noted a change in organisational practice or evidence of increased support or buy-in from their universities or external bodies. Chaplains recounted many examples of this, from a student recovering from a mental health crisis to a new chaplaincy post being created and funded by the university. Further analysis suggests that the most impactful chaplains may be those who work more hours, are paid, and are paid by the university rather than by a religion or belief organisation.

The vast majority of students and staff in universities, even those who have benefitted directly from chaplaincy, will have little idea of the range and depth of contribution that chaplains make to university life. We hope this report goes a long way to revealing just what this contribution is, and thus why chaplaincy should be further encouraged and resourced.

Data from students who use chaplaincy sheds further light on the impact of chaplaincy work. Chaplaincy, it seems, is used by a minority of a university’s students, but those who use it tend to use it often: more than half of the chaplaincy users we surveyed used chaplaincy at least once a week, and its users were more likely than an average student to be socially marginalised, for example to be an international, ethnic minority or lonely postgraduate student. Students use chaplaincy to participate in religious services run by chaplains, for pastoral support from a chaplain, to join group or social activities, and for prayer and reflection. The presence of chaplains in the chaplaincy space, even if they are not the prime reason a student enters that space, is important, and casual conversations with a chaplain about a film, a student’s course or life in general are experienced by students as just as important as, for instance, attending a religious event. Creating a safe space for students to explore life questions, values, and spirituality, and giving them time in a non-structured way, are things unique to chaplaincy that students value highly.
Chapter 8: University Chaplaincy and the Kingdom of God: A theological reflection

A view from somewhere

In preceding chapters, this research report has sought to speak in the measured language of the sociology of religion. Now the register changes: it becomes necessarily committed, and in this sense subjective, because only so can one engage in theology. This theological chapter is written from a Christian, more particularly Anglican, understanding of God and God’s purposes in the world as it reflects on some of our key findings about the nature and purpose of university chaplaincy. It should be read in three ways: first, as an argument for adopting Kingdom of God theology for the range and power of its ability to illuminate the work of chaplaincy; secondly, as a demonstration that our findings deserve theological engagement; thirdly, as an invitation to stimulate further responses, open to the discovery of synergies and contradictions on the part of other traditions of faith and belief.

Belief and context

The question, ‘What is the purpose of university chaplaincy?’ is irreducibly related to at least two others. These are: ‘What (religious) beliefs shape ministry?’ and ‘What is a university for?’. Comprehending the purpose of chaplaincy requires attention be paid to both belief and context.

One way of seeking to understand chaplaincy is to view it as a recognisable phenomenon which, though it emerges from the intersection of the particular faith and belief positions of chaplains with the peculiar range of contexts they serve, can be described in general terms. A form of this approach is adopted by a number of contributors to A Handbook of Chaplaincy Studies (2015). Pattison, for example, reads chaplaincy through a sociological perspective, finding that it occupies a ‘third space’ beyond specific religions which embodies and commends what society finds sacred. Ryan’s Chaplaincy: A Very Modern Ministry (2015) adopts a seemingly similar vantage point in order to make sense of the bewildering array of chaplaincy activity in multiple settings. However, his empirical stance reveals the danger of smoothing over differences in religion and belief, even as the approach he employs means these differences cannot be explored in detail. Ryan (2015: 63) writes,

…a ‘generic’ model of chaplaincy in which any chaplain sees any service user regardless of their respective faiths has a particular danger in undermining chaplains. It destroys the religious appeal…removes religious-specific actions which are often highly valued, and risks turning chaplains into nothing more than cheap counsellors without a particular identity of their own.

The case study research carried out in our project concurs: university chaplains do not see themselves as offering generic chaplaincy. Instead, most see their being and action grounded in a set of fundamental beliefs (see Chapter 2). Correspondingly, students appreciate chaplains that demonstrate integrity of faith. Belief matters, and it is not possible to understand chaplains, and by extension chaplaincy, without paying close attention to the frames of significance within which they interpret their purpose and meaning. The work of theological reflection is not optional.

The same must be said for context. University chaplaincy is not indifferent to the range of answers that can be given to the question: ‘What are universities for?’ These answers, as they take concrete form in lived choices and actions, shape how chaplaincy work is conceived and expressed. Indeed, a number of commentators see one crucial role of chaplains to be helping universities to rediscover and rearticulate their vocation (e.g. Walters 2018: 57). For Higton (2012: 256), chaplains are to recall universities to their highest good, yet also show the penultimate nature of that good.

117. As indicative of this, but not in any systematic way, examples of ‘overlapping consensus’ (John Rawls 1999 [1971]) and divergence are offered in the footnotes particularly from a Muslim perspective since, despite efforts to the contrary, circumstances precluded interviewing any Muslim chaplains at our case study universities.
118. The ability to do just this constitutes the first two of five essential qualities that Siddiqui (2007) suggests are required for a Muslim Chaplain.
119. Earlier in the book Higton relates Dan Hardy’s conviction that the penultimate aim of Christians in Higher Education is to recall a university to its fundamental purpose of serving the flourishing of society and so serving the common good. Their ultimate purpose is to draw members of the university into worship of the Trinitarian God (130ff).
Belief: The Kingdom of God

A theological framework within which to interpret the empirical observations resulting from this study of chaplaincy could take a number of forms. For example, in the recent essay volume *A Christian Theology of Chaplaincy* (Caperon et al. 2018), the conceptions of the incarnation of God in Jesus, the Trinitarian identity of God, and the church as the body of Christ, are used. The reflection offered here elects to use a different and complementary controlling motif, that of the Kingdom of God. Moreover, it will involve reading together: Jesus’ announcement and enactment of the Kingdom’s close proximity; the way the lens of Jesus’ crucifixion and resurrection was used to give further content to the meaning and outcome of Jesus’ mission; and the language of ‘new creation’ used by the apostle Paul (Gal. 6: 16 and 2 Cor. 5:17) and implied by Revelation (see Rev. 21:1-7). This framework is adopted not because it is judged ‘better’ than other possibilities, but because, in the limited space available, it offers a critical lens that is able to integrate a variety of findings into a meaningful whole.

Talking of the Kingdom of God moves us into eschatological territory. Eschatology is the combination of two Greek words: *eschata* (meaning last things); and *logos* (meaning here reasoned discussion) (Cross 1958). Reasoned discussion of the last things (traditionally interpreted as death, final judgement at Christ’s coming, heaven and hell), as Jürgen Moltmann (1967 [1964]: 15) famously observed, became detached from mainstream theological thinking, being safely placed in the ‘appendix’ of theological texts as a peripheral notion; it gets to the heart of what Jesus was about.

Close to the start of Mark’s Gospel, standing as both the introduction and summary of Jesus’ message - as its banner headline – is this announcement:

*Jesus came to Galilee, proclaiming the good news of God, and saying, ‘The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God has come near; repent, and believe in the good news’.*

In word and deed, in parable and miracle, in words of forgiveness and in table-fellowship with outcasts, Jesus does not merely announce the Kingdom; he enacts it in anticipatory realisation. The Kingdom emerges as a transformation of the world, *within* the existing fabric of the world, *for the sake* of the world. A brief examination of Jesus’ words and actions reveals how this transformation begins to take shape.

(i) *In relation to persons:* Jesus announces ‘good news to the poor’ (Mt 11:5; Lk 4:18) and keeps company with the crowds, sinners, tax-collectors and prostitutes. In doing so he bestows on them a new dignity. Jesus’ periodic meals with such ‘sinners’ constitute a sign that they would share the Kingdom (Sanders 1993: 194), that despite their apparent poor religious status, they have received forgiveness from God (Jeremias 1971: 112-14). As such these meals need to be read against the redemptive symbol of the banquet (Isa 25:6-8, c.f. Mt 8:11ff; 22:1-14, Mk 14:25 and parallels).

---

120. Here, of course, Muslim chaplains seek an alternative: ‘In Islam, God is infinite and humans are finite and they are separate and distinct. Islamic tradition does not believe God enters the human race nor does God dwell within the body of an individual. Therefore, the Christian model of chaplaincy is not helpful to Muslim chaplaincy due to differing belief systems’ (Caperon et al. 2018: 231). This is a particular issue where Muslims are called to integrate into already-established teams dominated by Christian conceptions (Rajput 2015: 232).

121. This consensus holds across a range scholars working from disparate vantage points. See for example: Blomberg 2018; Boff 1980; Bond 2012; Sanders 1993; Vermes 2009 and Wright 1998.


123. Blomberg’s (2018) judgement is that over against the consistently future interpretation of the Kingdom found in the work of Albert Schweitzer at the turn of the 20th century, and C. H. Dodd’s (mid-century) insistence that Jesus understood the Kingdom as being fully realised in the present, the consensus has remained with Joachim Jeremias that Jesus understood himself as inaugurating the Kingdom: it had begun to exist, but would only be fulfilled in the future (30f).
In relation to God:

Forgiveness is enacted on the basis of what Jesus believes God is like. God is supremely gracious (Mt 20:1-15), rejoicing over the return home of one who has lost their way (Lk 15:4-8) and, in a remarkable image, like a father who runs to meet a lost son before he has uttered any words of repentance, and who will not allow him to surrender his identity (Lk 15:19-21). ‘[I]n his scandalous conduct, Jesus is claiming to be realizing the love of God; he is claiming to act as God’s representative’ (Jeremias 1971: 120). As Sanders (1993: 194) confirms, ‘[a]n appreciable part of Jesus’ teaching consists in the assurance that God loves each individual (c.f. Mt 6:26, 10:29-13), no matter what the person’s short-comings, and that he wishes the return of even the worst’.

In relation to the created order:

Jesus introduces the proximity of God in such a way as to drive out of creation those forces which oppose life: he performs exorcisms (e.g. Mk 5:10-13) and healings (for example for a woman with a haemorrhage (Mk 5:24-34); for lepers (Lk 5:12-16); and even for the dead (Lk 7:11-17). These miracles can be seen not as bizarre and inexplicable aberrations of the ordinary, but as the emerging outlines of a new reality which will constitute the consummation of the ordinary (cf. Bauckham and Hart 1999). Jesus ‘probably saw his miracles as indicators that the new age was at hand... his miracles were signs of the beginning of God’s final victory over evil’ (Sanders 1993: 168). In this way Jesus ‘envisioned his healings and exorcisms not as bizarre and inexplicable aberrations of the ordinary, but as the emerging outlines of a new reality which will constitute the consummation of the ordinary (cf. Bauckham and Hart 1999). Jesus ‘probably saw his miracles as indicators that the new age was at hand... his miracles were signs of the beginning of God’s final victory over evil’ (Sanders 1993: 168). In this way Jesus ‘envisioned his healings and exorcisms not as bizarre and inexplicable aberrations of the ordinary, but as the emerging outlines of a new reality which will constitute the consummation of the ordinary (cf. Bauckham and Hart 1999). Jesus ‘probably saw his miracles as indicators that the new age was at hand... his miracles were signs of the beginning of God’s final victory over evil’ (Sanders 1993: 168).

In relation to time:

Jesus’ seeming freedom towards the Sabbath (e.g. Mk 2:23-3:6) can be understood not as some higher ethic, but rather a fulfilment of the Sabbath which itself acts as an anticipation of redemption (c.f. Dt 5:12-15). This is another consequence of the new proximity, the ‘at-handness’, of God.

In relation to space:

Jesus’ calming of the storm (e.g. Mk 4:35-41), the sea that was a symbol of chaos opposed to creation is brought under control in a manner reminiscent of God’s own action (c.f. Ps. 107: 23-30). Perhaps there is here a foretoken of the new creation (c.f. Rev 21:1).

Such demonstrations of the Kingdom’s nearness reach their definitive limit in the passion and crucifixion of Jesus. Now the God whose closeness once prompted the more intimate address of ‘Abba’ (Mk 14:36) is experienced as being absent: ‘My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?’ (Mk 15:34). Why was his death, which seemed so sharply to contradict Jesus’ message, not the end of Kingdom expectation (cf. Moltmann 1974: 125)? The answer lies in the resurrection appearances which came to be seen as a higher level realisation of the Kingdom, so that Jesus was understood to have been raised into the future of his own proclamation. In other words, the resurrection meant that the disciples did not give up on the idea that the Kingdom would come in its promised fullness (Sanders 1993: 276). And despite subsequent concerns over the ‘delay of the Parousia’, premature claims equating the Kingdom with Christendom, or reductions of the Gospel’s significance to inner, subjective life, the Kingdom expectation remains.

In the resurrection of the crucified Jesus, and here alone, creation permanently oversteps the limit of transience and death. His resurrection is not merely the illustration, ahead of time, of the saving future. Rather it is the expectation and the source of the resurrection of reality. Ultimately, as Moltmann (1967: 201, 211) affirms, the resurrection of Jesus will entail the new creation of all that exists. The new creation thus equates with the realisation of the Kingdom of God to its highest and furthest extent. It is constituted by the transfiguring consummation of creation - purified from sin, death and every disfiguring negativity - and caught up into conspicuous participation in the loving relations of the Trinitarian being of God.

Before we make use of this theological vision, three things must be emphasised. First, it is vitally important to perceive the Kingdom not as an alternative reality to this world. As the...

---

124. The ‘unconditional positive regard’ of the other, spoken of by the Head of Pastoral Support at Humanists UK (see Chapter 2), parallels, though without of course without the theistic basis, something of this disposition.

125. See, for example, Käsemann 1969.

126. For example Bultmann 1965 and von Harnack 1957.
hoped-for consummation of present experience, it has a this-worldly reference. One might say that in Jesus’ company life is not replaced by some better alternative, but the concrete reality of this life is stretched towards what it is meant to be: the sick are healed; the nobodies become somebodies; the oppressed find freedom; and those whose lives are going round in endless circles discover new hope and direction. In the terms of John’s Gospel, we can already begin to experience (eternal) life in all its fullness (Jn 10:10).  

Secondly, the Kingdom is to be received as a gift. All Jesus asks for is repentance, a turning back to God through realisation of one’s need of God, that one might enter the Kingdom of God. Occasionally, not even this seems required. There is nothing one can do to bring the Kingdom; that is God’s work alone. If the Kingdom is like a mustard seed (Mt 13:31ff) or yeast (Mt 13:33), all one can do is look around now for signs of the Kingdom that one day will erupt as a full loaf or a large tree. It grows on its own (Sanders 1993: 178ff). Thinking more philosophically, if the full realisation of the Kingdom means the new creation of all things, then manifestly its realisation lies beyond the bounds of any potentialities within creation. It is not a possibility for the world. It thus lies far beyond human achievement. Its realisation is the gift of God. Moltmann (1985: 132-5; c.f. 1996:23-9) introduces a very helpful distinction between the historical future (in which anticipations of the future take place) and the eschatological future (in which the Kingdom is fully realised) on the basis of two Latin terms. Futurum is that future which emerges by the selective realisation of the possibilities within the world – future in its commonplace sense, the future we can create. Adventus is the future that comes to the world from God, transcending that of which the world is capable – the future only God can bring about. Only God can bring the new creation. Instead, Christians are called to anticipate the Kingdom by imaginatively sighting a line of transformation from the world we presently know towards the promised fulfilment of our world, and then reading one’s own actions and the actions of others in the light of this vision.

Thirdly, the scope of the Kingdom is as broad as creation. It concerns persons, societies of persons, the ecological interrelationships between human societies and the natural world, and, as the object of God’s delight, the natural world itself.

What has all this to do with chaplaincy? If chaplaincy is a form of being and action inspired by the presence of Jesus and the Kingdom he brings, then chaplaincy has nothing to do with the introduction of a religious veneer over the surface of life. Rather, chaplaincy both explicitly – and much more often implicitly – concerns nothing less than the renewal and revitalisation of life.

Part of this will mean creating, watching for, and celebrating signs of the Kingdom (c.f. Walters 2018: 52). Chaplaincy has to do with life in all its fullness wherever this may be glimpsed.

Importantly, in the light of what has been said above, chaplaincy cannot offer a future of simple linear advancement towards an ever-improving future. There can be no simple notion of progress here. Rather, chaplaincy’s task is dialectically related to the present, creating a set of lived anticipations of what could be that tug towards a future that these anticipations cannot, in and of themselves, fully realise.

Conceiving of the future in this manner also means reckoning with the way in which the impression of the Kingdom on history also includes the form of the cross. Sometimes all one can do is stand in solidarity with others and ‘watch and wait’.

What then might a sign of the Kingdom look like in a university context? It might look like two people smiling at each other as they pass in the corridor in a moment of human recognition amidst the pressures of performance, or like a conversation in which one finds the grace to be honest and so is transformed. Signs might include laughter and humour as what seemed impossible is reframed and tamed, or the exhilarating moment when a concept believed too hard to grasp suddenly comes into focus. The Kingdom is glimpsed in acts of kindness, in the search for truth, in finding ways to reduce one’s negative impact on the environment, in the discovery of God’s love and acceptance. In short, the Kingdom is anticipated in the opening up of new possible possibilities, or in the grace to endure that which will not change.

126. John’s Gospel may be distinguished from the Synoptic Gospels of Mark, Matthew and Luke in numerous ways, one of which is its paucity of references to the Kingdom of God (which only in appear at Jn 3:3,5). The language of eternal life seems to be a key way in which John interprets the Kingdom’s meaning. See Blomberg (2018: 585ff).

128. See, for example, Mk 1:32-34; 2:1-12.

129. This view has obvious connections with the more modest, and more immediately practicable, notion of Tikken, seeking to repair the world one step at a time as articulated by the red brick Jewish chaplain (see Chapter 2).

130. Whipp (2018: 105) suggests that chaplains should offer a ‘truly disinterested service’ rooted in kenotic (self-emptying) theology. This certainly aligns with what this research has discovered about what students look for in chaplains and the sensibilities of many chaplains themselves. What is being implied in the theological reflection offered here, however, is that the commitment to be of service already presupposes a prior commitment to the flourishing of life. It could be understood as a way of advancing Jesus’ agenda of the Kingdom in which grace is the condition of freedom. Lambourne (1989) is helpful here.

131. Mk 14:32-40. This was a guiding principle for Cicely Saunders. See Boulay 2007.
Context: What are universities for?

This is a question much asked of late.132 Here we shall make heuristic use of Barnett (2011) in which he lays out an historically ordered set of three fundamental answers. They run from the mediaeval notion of ‘the metaphysical university’ through the conception which began to dominate during the height of the industrial revolution in the nineteenth century, ‘the research university’, into the contemporary ‘entrepreneurial university’. Barnett uses these shifting understandings to demonstrate that there is reason to believe that the present entrepreneurial form will give way to future alternative conceptions, and part of his purpose is to imagine ‘feasible utopias’ that might occupy this future. However, his work can also be used to suggest that these models of purpose are not simply successive, but rather describe dimensions of understanding about a university which persist, overlap and jar in a variety of ways. As he writes,

the forms of the university do not give way so easily as the ideas: a modern university is, at any one time, a layering of these forms…previous sedimentations remain, to offer conceptual and practical resources for renewal. In this postmetaphysical age, even remnants of the metaphysical stubbornly remain. (2011: 453)

How then are these three university forms understood?

The metaphysical university: this aimed through learning and enquiry to give ‘access to the transcendent realm’ (Barnett 2011: 441), to God’s creation and ultimately God himself. Its concern was the pursuit of Truth. ‘This was a sacred kind of learning, and with it came a hinterland of concepts such as ‘mystery’, ‘wonder’ and ‘wisdom’ (441) The curriculum aimed to prepare one for life in the world, but the process of knowing ‘opened a new and transcendent set of experiences’. In this way students were, in the language of John Henry Newman, to ‘ascend’ into a new and higher realm of being. It was a ‘university-for-the-beyond’ (441). Within this transcendent framework, knowledge exists as an ultimate unity of interconnected parts. The process of coming to know changes a person for the better as one is formed anew.

The research university: Instead of a unity, knowledge is, in this conception, differentiated into sharply defined disciplines with their own approaches and methodologies.

The process of coming to know no longer opens onto a transcendent above, nor is it expected to change one’s being. Science becomes the paradigm of research with an accompanying marginalisation of the humanities. Research concerns ‘knowledge for its own sake’ pursued via ‘academic freedom’ of enquiry. This freedom is bestowed in the hope that new understanding can harness the world of nature to human ends (not least in times of war), more latterly serving economic growth. This is the ‘university-in-itself’ (443) as self-contained with its own academic ethos. Higton (2012: 77) notes, however, that at the birth of the University of Berlin (now the Humboldt), the archetype of a research university, an inherently theological notion of free giving and receiving (rooted in the Body of Christ) was used as a model of ‘peaceable disputation’ against the ‘fractious and cacophonous ecclesiastical form in which that tradition [of argument] had come to them.’ In other words, the research university is also, in part, a product of theological influence.

The entrepreneurial university: ‘This is the university that had its being amid the marketisation of what were public services’ (Barnett 2011: 443) amidst the neo-liberal assumption of the universal efficiencies and benefits of the market (Law 2010). This university understands performance is necessary to survival and that what counts as performance is the ‘impact’ of its ‘knowledge products and services’ (Barnett 2011: 443) in terms of economic success and enhanced public status. Barnett emphasises that this notion of purpose has not been foisted upon universities by irresistible external forces. Rather, ‘“Academic capitalism”…is, to a large extent, embraced by them’ (444) so that there is a conscious attempt to continually change the university (conceived as business) to better serve its hoped-for success. This is the ‘university-for-itself’ (443). In the ensuing competition between and within universities, any sense that there might exist a ‘collective academic community’ (445) is fractured.

In this progression of university types, what changes are the fundamental ideas that inform the dominating frame of significance within which a university ‘understands itself and is expected to understand itself’ (445).133 Yet in any particular university each of these three types remain present in varying proportions, as what might be termed recognisable constellations of influence. The fivefold typology of universities employed in this research project also clusters universities by their rough date and circumstances of origin,

132. For example: Collini (2012 and 2018); Heap (2016); Sperlinger et al (2018); Willetts (2017).

133. Barnett (2011) fully expects this process to continue and accordingly sketches out a set of future possibilities, including his preferred option, the ecological university, now the subject of a major book (Barnett 2018). Here, the university inhabits and is inhabited by seven distinct ecosystems: knowledge; social institutions; persons; the economy; learning; culture; and the natural environment (55- 85 et passim). The purpose of a university is to serve the well-being of each of these seven (83ff).
hence: traditional elite; red brick; 1960s campus; post-1992; and Cathedrals Group. This differentiation is shown, repeatedly, to be significant over a wide range of aspects, suggesting that what grounds this typology includes the varying amalgamations of metaphysical, research and entrepreneurial sensibility present in each type.

If this is the case, chaplains not only need to be bilingual: able to move between the language of their faith and belief tradition and that of the institution they serve. Even within a single institution, they are required to be multilingual. They need the ability to comprehend themselves within, and make themselves comprehensible to, a competing range of perspectives on the purpose of a university. It is likely, then, that a chaplain’s conception of their primary aim will be shaped not only by their personal convictions, but also by the context of university purpose encountered. This is a supposition followed out below.

A brief theological commentary

Armed with the perspectives of belief and context developed above, how does Kingdom of God theology mesh with some of the key findings of this project?

As a ‘sacrament’ of the Kingdom of God, chaplains can be seen as harbingers and within the limits of futurum (see above), agents of a better future. Out of concern for the flourishing of those they encounter, and respecting the deeply relational nature of persons (with each other, with the wider environment and with the Trinity) they seek to create living anticipations of what reality can become with God. Uniquely, in the performance-driven ‘entrepreneurial university’ they witness to the priority of gift: that one is before one is asked to do, that inherent worth is not dependent on performance. Conceiving the purpose of chaplaincy to anticipate and witness to a better world can both secure and enhance our observation that, with very few exceptions, chaplains are received as both good news and appreciated as unique contributors to the university (see especially Chapters 3 and 6).

It follows that if chaplains stand for the priority of gift, as witnesses to God’s prevenient love that grounds both creation and new creation, then allowing themselves to be comprehended solely within a framework of measurable performance undercuts their symbolic value and actual function. Yet this pressure is precisely what exists in our currently highly marketised and increasingly competitive university system. The eschatological nature of the Kingdom provides reason to resist this pressure because, according to this view, a chaplain’s presence and action points to a beyond that cannot yet be achieved: the consummation of creation. Thus their work cannot be measured as if their present ‘impact’ were the finished article, the completed entity. In this way there is a properly theological basis for the diffidence demonstrated by chaplains concerning the recording of impact and effectiveness in performative terms (see Chapter 6). Such an approach cannot capture their full meaning and value. Yet chaplains do not have the luxury of simple refusal. The sustainability of chaplaincy in the performance-driven contemporary university will inevitably depend on a degree of compliance with this mode of measurement. Thus, chaplains need to find a way to live within an audit culture while also resisting its ultimate claim.

The Kingdom can be understood as a gift that creates a task; its hoped-for arrival calls forth the mobilisation of present possibilities in the form of concrete anticipations of its arrival. In this sense, performance – the performance of anticipation – has its place and can be related to the Christian calling to good works. Chaplains make a tangible difference, as this research records (see Chapter 3), and this difference deserves to be celebrated. But in narrating the contribution of chaplaincy one must be careful to see it as the offering of a gift in response to the prior receiving of a gift: the transformative love of God that opens onto the prospect of (new) life.

134. C.f. Ryan (2018: 82). Here Ryan picks up on what chaplains have long said about themselves.
135. Pattison (2015: 24ff)
136. C.f. Whipp’s (2018) timely warning, here speaking of a healthcare context: ‘There is a pressing temptation, within a scientifically and bureaucratically driven and resourced environment, to reduce the practices of spiritual care to some Procrustean bed of objectively measurable ‘interventions’ and reliably achievable ‘outcomes’. This is fundamentally wrong-headed, an iron cage that constrains the glorious freedom of the individual soul and the unpredictably rich journey of spiritual maturity’. Biesta (2013) argues just this about the process of education itself. Welby (2018: 94ff) concurs.
137. See Mt 5:16, Eph 2:10. Ryan (2015: 44ff) suggests four sympathetic criterion of impact which this Report has found meaningful and helpful (see especially Chapter 6).
Kingdom of God theology suggests that the primary aim of chaplains is inherently theological since it concerns participating in the *Missio Dei* – the sending of the Son and the Spirit by the Father in the wake of which the Kingdom comes into being. Yet, when chaplains were asked about their primary aim they gave a variety of answers, mission being only one category of seven identified during analysis. Moreover, a majority of Christian chaplains elected not to express their primary aim in theological terms, instead employing generic ‘secular’ language. Further empirical work would be required to test out precisely how chaplains might respond to this observation, and what follows is not an attempt to second-guess their responses. Rather, this contradiction is a stimulus to think more deeply about how the Kingdom might impinge on the chaplaincy task in the concrete context of a university.

It is instructive to begin by examining the distribution of language used by chaplains to describe their primary aim. Doing so suggests that the likelihood of using theological language is dependent, to some degree, on the choice of aim expressed.

The aim of mission has a very high likelihood of being expressed in Christian theological terms (93% of chaplains interviewed by telephone did so). Presence comes next at some remove (38% of chaplains), however, this level of use is still statistically significant compared to, for example, the statement of a pastoral aim.

The choice of language employed may result from chaplains’ multi-linguistic sensitivity alluded to above. In other words, the register chosen to express one’s primary aim is likely to vary, in part, depending upon the understanding of the purpose of a university as this is met in lived, experienced form. Chaplains develop habits of speaking in terms comprehensible within the university context. The use of ‘secular’ language, therefore, may say more about the adaptation of chaplains to their context than their inner convictions.

![Figure 8.1](image-url)  
*Figure 8.1: Christian chaplains’ use of language in expression of their primary aim*

138. P = < 0.001.
139. P = < 0.001.
140. It is possible, of course, that in choosing where to operate as a chaplain, in as much as this choice is available, those with particular convictions select sympathetic environments.
Here we can again draw upon Barnett’s (2011) work. Could it be that where the metaphysical aspect of a university finds legitimacy and endorsement, chaplains will find it more conducive to speak in explicitly Christian terms? And that in such an environment, the aims that appear to require more of a theological register, those of mission (drawing people into God’s purpose) and presence (accompaniment aimed at transformation) rooted in incarnational thinking) are more likely to be expressed? What is in mind here is not any simple, direct causative relationship, but rather a propensity towards particular expression that could find empirical support. Confirmation that such a link likely exists is found in Figure 2.2 (Chapter 2). Distinctively, in Cathedrals Group universities, the only member of our five-fold university typology where an explicit connection is made between the Christian metanarrative and the university’s understanding of purpose, mission and presence are the two most popular choices of primary aim. Speculating further, where the ‘research’ aspect of a university finds emphasis, with its concern for critical reason and unfettered debate, chaplains may prioritise expression of a prophetic aim or the desire to encourage spiritual exploration outside particular defined religious traditions. Figure 2.2 gives some tentative grounds for thinking this is so. For example, a prophetic aim is a noticeably more popular choice in red brick universities, and a spiritual aim in traditional elites. Finally, within the orbit of an ‘entrepreneurial’ conception of a university with its emphasis on ‘customer care’ (of students and research clients) and service provision, we might expect the pastoral and religious aims of chaplains to find ready comprehension. Given the current prevalence of ‘entrepreneurial’ thinking, it is perhaps not surprising that, with the exception of the Cathedrals Group, these two categories are the most popular choice of primary aim expressed by chaplains across institutional types. It is for parallel reasons, one might suggest, that the pastoral and religious aims are the two most readily expressed and understood by managers of chaplaincy in our case study universities. They fit with the worldview managers are asked to inhabit. This form of analysis also sheds light on why chaplains offer a wider range of primary aims than the managers who support them (see Chapter 2). University chaplaincy has existed in something like its current form since the 1960s (Brown 2012), so affording an inherited tradition of purpose that existed before the entrepreneurial paradigm took precedence. A concern for the management of chaplaincy performance is, however, largely a product of just this entrepreneurial conception.

Returning to the question of language, observe that, from Figure 8.1, any of the seven primary aims can be expressed in explicitly Christian theological language. Take the most popular primary aim, that of pastoral purpose. Though 86% of Christian chaplains who describe this as their primary aim do so in generic language, pastoral work can clearly be grounded theologically. Jesus identifies ‘love of neighbour’ as a fundamental stance of life before God. In the telling of the parable of the ‘good Samaritan’ Jesus shifts the basis of neighbourly action from personal autonomy (works) to the need of the other that awakens a response of care (grace). Disturbingly, it is thus the one in need who defines the neighbour (Thielicke 1959). The parable can be read as an explanation of how God in Jesus is reaching out to others, across social and religious boundaries, in the advance of the Kingdom. This exercise of finding a theological basis can be repeated for each of the other primary aims; each aim can be comprehended within the comprehensive scope of the Kingdom. Thus, to combine the seven categories of aim, through loving care, religious symbol, the availability of presence, concern with the spiritual, the prophetic quest for justice and the building of good relationships, the mission of the Kingdom goes forward. On this analysis, then, the category of mission can be properly stretched to include all others. Any of the primary aims discerned may be seen as a legitimate expression of mission.

So far it is the distinction between theological and secular language that has been used to stimulate reflection. However, Kingdom theology also raises some interesting questions about the easy validity of this distinction. If mission for the sake of the Kingdom concerns fullness of life, the fullness

141. See Dunlop (2017) on this point.
142. Though between Cathedrals Group members there appears to be significant variation in how conspicuously this claim is made. See Heap (2012).
143. Figure 2.5 (Chapter 2) reveals that traditional elite universities, where there is a strong cultural remainder of their Christian origins, also provide an environment in which Christian theological language is more prevalent.
144. This is clearly also the case for Islam. ‘The idea of service and help to those in need is of course a very basic tenet of Islam’ (Siddiqui 2007: 46). Hafiz (2015: 95ff) comments: ‘The two most often-mentioned qualities of God in the Quran are mercy and compassion, virtues which all Muslims are required to practise. The Prophet encouraged Muslims to exercise compassion towards all human beings regardless of their faith, culture or origin…It is clear that there is much commonality between the Christian concept of pastoral care and that of Islam’.
145. Mk 12:31 and parallels. See also Romans 13:10.
146. Dunlop (2017: 174) sees presence as a ‘much-needed paradigm of mission’.
147. We are indebted to Stephen Heap for this observation.
of this life experienced now, then the separation between the secular and the theological begins to break down since the Kingdom can be understood as the worldly, the secular, renewed and brought to consummation. In the new creation there is no temple, only the worldly indwelling of God.\footnote{See Rev 21: 3, 22f.}

Mission, then, is being interpreted broadly: as witness to and anticipation of the Kingdom which comes to fulfil (not replace) creation.\footnote{A concern for mission in this sense contrasts with some Muslim voices. Rajput (2015: 238) writes, ‘Muslim chaplaincy is not about ministry or mission nor is it considered to be a continuation of God’s work. It is a support role that is considered by Muslim chaplains as solicitous towards humanity...Therefore, in contrast to Christian chaplaincy, Muslim chaplaincy is primarily concerned with humanistic care and support of the individual with reference to religious intentions.’} It has to be said that this stands in tension with some of the current priorities of the Church of England. The present ‘Renewal and Reform’ initiative, begun in 2015, is a response to declining church attendance.\footnote{Caperon (2018a: 14).}

One of the clear and intended outcomes of this work is to reverse the decline of the Church of England so that we become a growing church, in every region and for every generation; a church open to and for everyone in England, building up the Body of Christ and working for the common good. (General Synod)

Despite this wider concern with the common good\footnote{The phrase ‘the work of the Kingdom’ (General Synod: paragraph 4) is also present, but does not appear to counteract the emphases detected by others.} (the first of the Church of England’s Quinquennial Goals (2010)) a number of commentators are concerned that Renewal and Reform places an over-emphasis on evangelisation,\footnote{For example, Walters and Bradley (2018: 147) helpfully articulate reasons why chaplains need to exercise caution in evangelism.} the making of disciples and numerical growth.\footnote{See Caperon (2018b: 128f). See also Todd et al. (2014: 33f), who are troubled by how well this agenda speaks to the experience of chaplaincy.} Though these are fine ambitions in themselves, viewed apart from the wider purview of the Kingdom, the result is an attenuated view of mission that concentrates on self-replication of the church, insufficiently capturing a capacious vision of the flourishing of life (Caperon 2018b: 130f). There is also a worry that the Renewal and Reform initiative capitulates to the neo-liberal conception of the market, with an accompanying short term interest in measurable results (c.f. Todd 2018: 38). By contrast, ‘Chaplains characteristically play the long game’, sowing seeds they may never witness grow (Todd et al. 2014: 34).

It is the breadth of Kingdom vision that coheres with a characteristic feature of chaplaincy university managers prize: chaplains transcend university structures (see Chapter 2). The transcendence of chaplaincy could be read as a consequence of the transcendence of the Kingdom; it encompasses persons, communities, ideas, the natural world, matter, time and space. With the exception of those at the highest levels of senior management, it is probably only chaplains who have a legitimate concern for every aspect of university life, and this holistic vision and university-wide experience is clearly valued.

What though of other perspectives of religion and belief? Might the claimed breadth of the Kingdom now be seen as a form of Christian imperialism? Demographically universities are multi-faith-and-belief communities, though the exact degree and pattern of diversity varies considerably from institution to institution. Accordingly, there is an increasing tendency to badge chaplaincy services as ‘multi-faith’ as a way of signalling that the needs of all should be met. Yet this research has discovered that Christian chaplains provide 84% of all paid time and 71% of all volunteer time across university chaplaincy (see Chapter 1). Dissonance can thus arise between the ‘multi-faith’ labelling of chaplaincy and its actual day-to-day functioning (see Chapter 5). Siddiqui (2007: 50-52) describes some of the difficulties encountered by Muslim chaplains in seeking to work in an alleged multi-faith context where there is an effective Christian hegemony. A Christian, particularly Anglican, concern for all cannot be unthinkingly assumed to suffice for the multifarious needs of those who hold varying positions of religion and belief.

Christians have a responsibility to use their position of power to open up genuine ways of working collaboratively with others while seeking to safeguard the religious integrity of all involved. Christian theology has its own part to play by facilitating generous partnerships. Williams (2018: 61-74) suggests a number of constructive ways forward.

\footnote{Caperon (2018b: 128f).}
These include discovering a shared appreciation of the ultimate unknowability of God, making common cause in speaking against ‘reductive secular instrumentalism’, and exploring perichoretic (hence non-hierarchical) forms of shared leadership. The eschatological nature of Christianity affirmed in Kingdom theology has a role to play also. Central to Christian theology is the discernment of a fundamental distinction between the ‘now’ and the ‘then’ (not yet).

For now we see in a mirror, dimly, but then we will see face to face. Now I know only in part; then I will know fully, even as I have been fully known.153

Christian existence lives between the ‘now’ of forgiveness and reconciliation with God, and the ‘then’ of the final defeat of death and transience in a new creation. Just as the coming of the Kingdom in all its fullness must be awaited, so must the final unveiling of the truth. Living ‘between the times’, then, Christian chaplains cannot claim to be in possession of the whole picture. Without abandoning convictions, indeed using these as a test and criterion, humility is called for in listening and reflecting on other voices for the truth they hold. To do otherwise is to falsely claim possession of that which is awaited in hope. Moreover, a closure against others would be contrary the one virtue which Paul is convinced runs like a golden thread straight from the ‘now’ to the ‘then’: love.156

The breadth of the Kingdom’s potential reach should not, therefore, be used to exclude other views, be these religious, philosophical, moral or scientific. Rather, the Kingdom holds out the prospect of a radical inclusivity that conditions every present outlook.

Conclusion

Kingdom theology can nurture an authentic Christian identity that is genuinely relevant to the needs of a university community. The Lord’s Prayer captures the heart of Jesus’ understanding of the Kingdom, and looks towards its fulfilment. The Benedictus,157 which stands at the centre of Morning Prayer in the Anglican tradition (and other traditions) points towards a labour of preparation which, through a making known of the possibility of forgiveness, awaits the breaking of the ‘dawn from on high’ that shines on those who ‘dwell in darkness and the shadow of death’. The Kingdom and its preparation are fundamental ideas which ground a Christian identity. Yet this work of preparation, of anticipation of the Kingdom, in which chaplaincy can be understood, reaches to every corner of life on the basis of the hoped-for new creation. The hope of the redemptive transformation of all makes chaplaincy, in principle at least, relevant to all.

In a context where the enacted purpose of a university is variously and inconsistently demonstrated, at a time when chaplains are increasingly asked to view themselves as an extension of professional support services, theology is vital. Theology can provide a frame of significance within which the work of chaplaincy can find meaning, value, affirmation and orientation even as chaplains seek to collaborate positively with those who conceive of their own agency within a different purview. More boldly, universities can be read as having an inherent theological value.158 If this is so, chaplaincy cannot be viewed as an ‘add on’, but as a service that genuinely belongs and can, as Higton (2012) suggests, recall a university to its highest calling. Education and research are processes by which one is taken beyond one’s present understanding. They concern transcendence. The quest for knowledge and understanding always subverts existing boundaries; it questions the propriety and legitimacy of such boundaries. Education will not stay put within a defined curriculum. In relation to the status quo education is always dangerous because it incessantly raises the question of meaning wherever this appears to be settled. Education renders things uncertain; it keeps the future open. Education, therefore, belongs to the eschatological hope of the Kingdom, and thereby, chaplaincy belongs to education.

154. As Moltmann (1967: 16) famously stated: ‘From first to last, and not merely in the epilogue, Christianity is eschatology, is hope...The eschatological is not one element of Christianity, but it is the medium of Christian faith as such...For Christian faith lives from the raising of the crucified Christ, and strains after the promises of the universal future of Christ.’

155. 1 Cor. 13:12.

156. 1 Cor. 13:13.

157. Lk 1:68-79

158. This is apparent from the use made here of Barnett (2011). See also Heap (2016).
Recommendations

For chaplains:

1. **Chaplains should undertake training in chaplaincy where it is available, and ask their religion and belief organisations and universities to provide it where it is not.** The vast majority of university chaplains have not received specific training in chaplaincy and this should be remedied. The demands of university chaplaincy are, as this report has demonstrated, distinct, and likely to become more significant, so as student numbers grow, the student population diversifies, and their pastoral support needs become more extensive and complex.

2. **Complementing and building upon their commitments to their faith tradition, chaplains should strive to work in ways that are particularly fruitful within universities: via relationship-building, pastoral presence and inclusivity.** The findings illustrate that chaplaincy works best when chaplains: 1) build strong relationships across university departments; 2) build a ministry of presence by offering non-judgemental pastoral support among staff and students; and 3) work with their universities to further a culture of inclusivity and respect. This is a more realistic aspiration for full-time and coordinating/lead chaplains, so chaplains in these positions should consider how such practices can be better embedded in chaplaincy in their universities.

For universities:

3. **Universities should appoint chaplains and faith advisors from the diverse religion and belief groups represented among their students and staff.** This may not always extend across the full range of world religions in the UK, but should reflect the spread of orientations to religion (including humanism) among the staff and student body. An annual anonymous survey of staff and student faith identities would ensure that this arrangement is accurately maintained. Universities should, whenever possible, ensure that those they appoint as chaplains are officially recognised by a specific religion or belief group. When this is not possible – e.g. among smaller, less well-resourced traditions – it is especially important that these chaplains are offered relevant support via the appointing university.

4. **Universities should increase their funding of chaplaincy.** Chaplains provide a huge amount of voluntary labour to universities. Volunteer chaplains play a vital role, but full-time and paid chaplains are better equipped for chaplaincy work and more embedded within their university structures. Our findings illustrate the range of contributions chaplains make to university life, including supporting students to integrate, progress with their university studies, develop their identities and practice their religion. As student pastoral needs grow, universities increasingly depend on chaplains to supplement other student support services. As religion and belief groups are becoming unable to sustain their current levels of funding for chaplaincy, universities need to increase budgets for chaplaincy across the sector. Universities should, in particular, commit to providing funds for chaplains’ salaries.

5. **Universities should provide all chaplains, paid and volunteers, with office and meeting space, IT and phone facilities, a line manager, an activities budget and staff development and training.** This space is vital for chaplains to do effective work with students and staff, for example hosting events for students and offering one-to-one pastoral support. Attention should be given to providing resources that meet the religious needs of the staff and student bodies (e.g. faith-sensitive prayer, kitchen and washing facilities).

6. **Universities should recognise the unique, positive and broad-ranging contribution chaplains make to the lives of university students, staff and their wider communities.** They should strive to treat chaplains as integral to the university’s aims and mission, and to balance the need for chaplains to be accountable to the university with the need to exercise their religious role freely. Whichever model of managing chaplaincy universities use (e.g. locating chaplaincies within student services departments, or supporting their autonomy as a separate unit), universities should balance chaplains’ freedom and accountability. Finally, universities should recognise that chaplains’ contribution extends beyond serving the needs of people of faith; chaplains also serve the wider university and the non-religious.

7. **Universities should reflect on how their history and institutional identities shape their approach to chaplaincy, and whether their approach needs to change.** Traditional elite universities and Cathedrals Group universities should ensure that chaplaincy provision meets the needs of a religiously-diverse and international student body and is not simply or overwhelmingly Christian. Red brick and post-1992 universities should consider increasing their funding of chaplaincy and its resources (e.g. space, budgets and facilities). 1960s campus universities should consider increasing their funding of salaries for chaplains. Those committed to the idea of universities being thoroughly secular spaces should reflect on whether this approach truly meets the support needs of their students.
**For religion and belief organisations:**

8. **Religion and belief organisations should reflect on how they might recognise and value the major positive contribution chaplains make to the lives of university students, staff and their wider communities.** Chaplains contribute a great deal to university life and are also representatives and ambassadors for their traditions among a large and diverse population. Not all religion and belief organisations appear to have recognised this opportunity or invested in it. Our research suggests university chaplains achieve most when they are trusted and recognised as integral to their religious community’s aims and mission.

9. **National religion and belief organisations should, when resources permit, provide management, training and support for their chaplains.** Not all chaplains are affiliated to or authorised by a religion or belief organisation, but there are obvious advantages to this being the case. National organisations should consider what they can do to reinforce systems of training, mentoring and accountability in order to support chaplains more effectively. Religion and belief organisations should, where possible, enable their chaplains to work with local communities and religious groups.

10. **The Church of England should reflect on how it might enhance its capacity to support, nurture and develop university chaplaincy in a wider sense.** As this research has demonstrated, the Church of England occupies an influential place in university chaplaincy. Its established status and greater resources relative to other traditions mean it is in a stronger position to steer and support chaplaincy; it often does so via coordinating or lead chaplains. The Church of England should use its influence to uphold voices of religion and belief across the higher education sector, and its resources to build partnerships of trust and mutual respect. This will enable others to speak and be heard, enhancing university chaplaincy for the good of all.

**For all parties:**

11. **Chaplains, universities and religious organisations should reflect on whether and how best to record their impact on universities.** The research in this report demonstrates that chaplains contribute to the life of their universities in a variety of important ways. It is hoped that those sceptical about the value of having chaplains in universities will read about these wide-ranging contributions and revise their view. The future of chaplaincy will be more firmly secured if universities have access to a record of how their chaplains are contributing to their work and life.

12. **Staff working in student support and professional services and in chaplaincy should build collaborative working relationships.** Our research highlights how chaplains and university managers sometimes understand chaplaincy in different ways, but when the two groups work together, strong working relationships are built which benefit both students and staff. Induction programmes should provide a starting point for this. Integration of chaplains on university committees is also important. The fostering of religious literacy (for university staff) and university literacy (for chaplains) would both be wise aspirations for universities to embrace if these relationships are to flourish.

13. **Universities, chaplains and religion and belief organisations should work together to support and develop religion-specific chaplaincy within a multi-faith context.** Multi-faith and inter-faith approaches within chaplaincy teams are vital, especially as this better reflects the religious diversity of the wider UK and is more likely to foster broader religious literacy. But this religious literacy also needs to acknowledge that chaplains who pursue an approach that is primarily shaped by their own faith tradition are not thereby less qualified or less likely to foster inclusivity and community in the broader university. Part of enhancing the work of chaplains involves respecting their prerogative to work from and for their own religious or belief tradition as part of a wider community of practice.
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## Appendix 1

### Chaplains in 99 universities by paid/voluntary status and religion or belief group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith or belief</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>% of the FTE paid time</th>
<th>Voluntary</th>
<th>% of the FTE per faith group that is voluntary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>FTE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>FTE</strong></td>
<td><strong>% of the 238.26 FTE paid time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>FTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baha’i</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>112.55</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>98.28</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>64.11</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48.20</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33.70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-faith</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21.34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaker</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other New Religious Movements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>330.9</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>238.26</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>92.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

159. This totals 99.7% due to rounding.
## List of case study university interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Chaplains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical School manager</td>
<td>Pagan chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Music</td>
<td>Buddhist chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Services</td>
<td>Lead Christian chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>Roman Catholic chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Union President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Experience</td>
<td>Jewish chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Head of Operations</td>
<td>Anglican chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Biology</td>
<td>Buddhist chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Welfare</td>
<td>Anglican lead chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Tutor in Theology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Union officer</td>
<td>Roman Catholic chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General registrar</td>
<td>Friends International chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Student Support</td>
<td>Methodist chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic registrar</td>
<td>Anglican chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Support Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of HR</td>
<td>Sikh chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Wellbeing</td>
<td>Assistant Roman Catholic chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director of Student Services</td>
<td>Anglican lead chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Legal Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>Roman Catholic lead chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Theology</td>
<td>Roman Catholic chaplain (Priest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Vice Chancellor for Student Experience</td>
<td>Free Church chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Union Officer</td>
<td>Methodist chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Roman Catholic Assistant chaplain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## List of local and national representatives interviewed

### Local Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of England Archdeacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Scotland leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Evangelical leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic Bishop’s representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Chaplaincy Group Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### National Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedrals Group Vice Chancellor (CUAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of England National HE Policy Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanists UK representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Jewish Chaplaincy representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic National Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>